W 286.22
N 499.4
v.7

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

SEVENTH CONGRESS

AT PITTSBURGH, PA.

March 6, 7, and 8, 1917

Program, Proceedings, and Papers

I. The Basis and Federation of Religious Liberals
II. Religious Reconstruction

Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D.
Charles W. Wendte, D.D.
William Rosenau, D.D.

Rev. Richard W. Boynton
Lee S. McCollester, D.D.
Alfred W. Martin, A.M., S.T.B.

Morris Knowles, C.E.

BX
6
N4
A5
1917
GTU
Storage

NAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

SEVENTH CONGRESS
AT PITTSBURGH, PA.
March 6, 7, and 8, 1917

Program, Proceedings, and Papers

I. The Basis and Federation of Religious Liberals
II. Religious Reconstruction

Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D.
Charles W. Wendte, D.D.
William Rosenau, D.D.

Rev. Richard W. Boynton
Lee S. McCollester, D.D.
Alfred W. Martin, A.M., S.T.B.

Morris Knowles, C.E.

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

BX
6
N4
A5
917

FOREWORD.

It is to be regretted that from lack of means a complete report in print of the proceedings and papers of the Seventh Congress of the National Federation of Religious Liberals is not possible to us. The pages which follow will, it is hoped, give a fair presentation of its general attitude and spirit in the religious world of America to-day and justify its purpose and endeavors.

It is a profound regret to us that since the holding of this Congress in Pittsburgh one of its most prominent and gifted leaders, Rabbi Dr. J. Leonard Levy, who welcomed us to his temple and presided over our opening session, has passed away from earth. We have lost in his departure a high-minded and brave witness for truth and humanity, and a generous and influential friend. We who remain must dedicate ourselves the more earnestly to the great tasks in which he was our honored and beloved associate and helper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. Foreword, and Table of Contents.
2. Program of the Congress. With illustrative readings.
3. An Appreciation of the Congress.
4. Report of the Secretary for 1916–17.
5. Financial Report for 1916.
6. Address: A Basis for Unity. By the President, Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D.
7. Address: The Federation of Religious Liberals. By the Secretary, Charles W. Wendte, D.D.
8. Address: The Mutual Relations between Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity To-day. By Rev. Dr. William Rosenau.
9. Address: The Need for a New Vision of God. By Rev. Richard Wilson Boynton.
10. Address: The Religion of Jesus and the Modern World. By Rev. Lee S. McCollester, D.D.
11. Address: The Rebirth of the Immortal Hope. By Alfred W. Martin, A.M., S.T.B.
12. Address: Social Responsibility of Industry. By Morris Knowles, C.E.

PROGRAM OF THE

Seventh Congress

OF THE

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

IN

PITTSBURGH, PA.

March 6, 7, and 8, 1917

By Invitation of Ministers and Churches of Pittsburgh

"The purpose of the Federation is to promote the religious life by united testimony for sincerity, freedom, and progress in religion, by social service, and a fellowship of the spirit beyond the lines of sect and creed."

"Participation in the Federation will leave each individual responsible for his own opinions alone."

LOCAL COMMITTEE OF INVITATION AND ARRANGEMENTS.

Rev. Carl August Voss, D.D., Chairman, 411 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., German Evangelical Protestant Church.
Rev. Charles E. Snyder, Secretary, 1024 Sheffield Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., Northside Unitarian Church.
Rev. A. J. Bonsall, Litt.D., Sandusky Street Baptist Church.
Rev. Wyatt Brown, Litt.D., The Church of The Ascension, Protestant Episcopal.
Rev. G. Herbert Ekins, Plymouth Congregational Church.
Rev. Alleyne C. Howell, Saint Stephen's Church, Protestant Episcopal, Sewickley, Pa.
Rev. Luther Freeman, Emory Methodist Episcopal Church.
Rev. Carman C. Johnson, The River Brethren (Dunkards).
Rev. Frederick Tower Galpin, D.D., First Baptist Church.
Rev. Martin Leiseder, United Evangelical Church, Etna, Pa.
Rev. J. Leonard Levy, D.D., Temple Rodeph Shalom.
Rev. Samuel M. Lindsay, First Baptist Church, Bellevue, Pa.
Rev. S. B. McCormick, D.D., Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh.
Rev. Malcolm L. MacPhail, Ph.D., First Presbyterian Church, Northside.
Rev. L. Walter Mason, D.D., First Unitarian Church.
Rev. Robert B. Miller, D.D., Third United Presbyterian Church.
Rev. William A. Prosser, United Peoples Church.
Rev. George E. A. Reschke, German Evangelical Church.
Rev. George B. Richards, Emanuel Church, Protestant Episcopal.
Rev. Edward S. Travers, Trinity Church, Protestant Episcopal.
Rev. Robert J. Pilgram, Reformed Church of The Ascension.
Rev. William Porkess, Grace Church, Protestant Episcopal.
Rev. Edward H. Ward, D.D., St. Peter's Church, Protestant Episcopal.
Rev. Lucius H. Bugbee, Christ Methodist Episcopal Church.
J. Byron Deacon, The Society of Friends.
Rev. John Ray Ewers, East End Christian Church.
Rev. Arthur D. Hilton, Shady Avenue Baptist Church.
Rev. Charles W. Tinsley, Methodist Episcopal Church, Crafton, Pa.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

was organized at Philadelphia, December 2, 1908, at a private conference of representative liberal religious thinkers and social workers of the United States. Its purpose is to unify and concentrate the forces which make for religious sincerity, freedom, tolerance, and progress in America, and bring them, so far as may be, into council and co-operation concerning the spiritual and ethical interests they possess in common. In a sense this Federation may be considered as the offspring of the International Congress of Religious Liberals, with which it is affiliated, and whose liberalizing and reconciling influences it is intended to conserve and further in the American community. This International Congress has held six sessions in Europe and the United States, with a membership of 2000, representing officially and unofficially 30 nationalities, and over 100 different religious fellowships.

The National Federation holds, from time to time, extended public meetings of religious liberals in centres of American thought and life, at which united testimony is given in behalf of the great universal affirmations of the moral and religious life. It seeks to increase the faith of free and reasoning men in the underlying principles of pure religion held in the spirit of perfect liberty; to foster the sentiments of tolerance and good-will, both religious and racial, in the community; and to promote a fellowship of the spirit based on religious character and conduct, and not on creed and rite.

Furthermore, the Federation labors for social reform and good citizenship. It strives for the awakening of the public conscience, the promotion of social justice, and a better performance of social service and obligation. The approved institutions of human society—the family, the school, the church, and the state—in their ideal aspects receive its homage and support. The Federation co-operates with every agency which endeavors to uplift the national character and to invigorate it with ethical and social aims.

The Federation has held six congresses in Philadelphia, New York City, Rochester, N.Y., and Oakland, Cal.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS.

President.

Professor JESSE H. HOLMES, Ph.D., of Swarthmore College, Pa.

Secretary.

CHARLES W. WENDTE, D.D., 165 Hunnewell Avenue, Newton, Mass., to whom applications for membership and communications may be addressed.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

ELIZABETH POWELL BOND, Society of Friends, Philadelphia, Pa.
SAMUEL A. ELIOT, D.D., President American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.
DANIEL EVANS, D.D., Professor Andover Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.
GEORGE H. FERRIS, D.D., Pastor First Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
MORRIS JASTROW, Ph.D., Professor University of Pennsylvania (Ethical Culture Society).
JENKIN LLOYD JONES, Litt.D., Minister Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.
LEE S. MCCOLLESTER, D.D., Universalist, Dean Crane Theological School, Tufts College, Mass.
HENRY MOTTET, D.D., Rector Church of the Holy Communion, New York City.
LUCIA AMES MEAD, National Secretary Women's Peace Party, Boston, Mass.
WILLIAM ROSENAU, D.D., President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.
JOSEPH SWAIN, LL.D., Friend, President Swarthmore College, Pa.
AMBROSE WHITE VERNON, D.D., Minister Harvard Congregational Church, Brookline, Mass.

Council.

Professor JESSE H. HOLMES, Ph.D., Swarthmore, Pa.
CHARLES W. WENDTE, D.D., Newton, Mass.
Dr. O. EDWARD JANNEY, Baltimore, Md.
HENRY BERKOWITZ, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. J. HERMAN RANDALL, New York.
Professor ANNA GARLIN SPENCER, Meadville, Pa.
S. BURNS WESTON, Philadelphia, Pa.
J. CLARENCE LEE, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
CARL A. VOSS, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.
FRANK O. HALL, D.D., New York City.
Rev. HENRY R. ROSE, Newark, N.J.
Rev. MINOT O. SIMONS, Cleveland, Ohio.
MRS. WM. C. GANNETT.
J. BARNARD WALTON, Philadelphia, Pa.

Individual Membership in the Federation may be secured by application to its Secretary and a payment of the annual dues,—one dollar.

ILLUSTRATIVE READINGS.

(COMPILED BY C. W. WENDTE.)

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE SPIRIT.

The letter killeth, the spirit maketh alive.
Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.—*N. T.*

Any real unity in the religious world must be spiritual, not theological. Real religious fellowship cannot be made or maintained if based on assent to speculative opinions and dogmatic doctrines. Whatever the label may be, wherever there is enough of the spirit of God to insure substantial liberty, there is a basis for spiritual unity, which may grow into a real brotherhood in fact, and not simply in name.—*Henry W. Wilbur.*

Intellectual sympathies are limited, but moral sympathies are universal.—*Ralph Waldo Emerson.*

Faith has already ceased to be itself, if polemically said.—*Ralph Waldo Emerson.*

Respect differences if you would find unity; you shatter differences only to multiply them.—*Rabindranath Tagore, Hindu Theist.*

Our interest should centre in the things that underlie all creeds and overarch all sects.—*J. Fort Newton, Pastor-elect, City Temple, London, Liberal Christian.*

Conformists die, but heretics live on forever.—*Elbert Hubbard, Free-thinker.*

I have no regard to persons or professions; for, when we come into the truth, it will banish from the earth all sectarianism; and, when we come back into the state which we ought to be in, to become the children of God, we shall all be brethren and sisters of one family.—*Elias Hicks, Friend.*

We cannot break down the party walls which divide us, but we can build them so low that men may be able to shake hands across them.—*Thomas Binney, Nonconformist.*

Give me thine hand. I do not mean, be of my opinion; you need not, I do not expect or desire it, neither do I mean I will be of your opinion. I cannot; it does not depend on my choice, I can no more think than I can see or hear as I will. Keep your opinion and I mine, as steadily as ever. You need not endeavor to come over to me, or bring me over to you. I do not desire you to dispute points or to hear or speak one word concerning them. *Only give me thine hand.* I do not mean embrace my modes of worship, or I will embrace yours. I have no desire to dispute with you one moment; let all matters stand aside, let them never come into sight. If thine heart is my heart, if thou love God and all mankind, I ask no more, *give me thine hand.*—*John Wesley, Methodist.*

Shall I ask the brave soldier who fights by my side
In the cause of mankind if our creeds disagree?
Shall I give up the friend I have valued and tried,
If he kneel not before the same altar with me?
—*Thomas Moore, Roman Catholic.*

PROGRAM OF THE CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

Tuesday Evening, March 6, at 8 o'clock.

OPEN MEETING AT THE TEMPLE RODEPH SHALOM.

Topic, "THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE SPIRIT."

1. Religious Service conducted by Rabbi Dr. J. Leonard Levy and Revs. Carl A. Voss, D.D., and Charles E. Snyder.
2. Address by President Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D., of Philadelphia, Pa., "The Religion of the Spirit and the Life."
3. Address by Rev. Charles W. Wendte, D.D., "The Federation of Religious Liberals."
4. Address by Rabbi William Rosenau, D.D., President Central Conference of American Rabbis, "The Mutual Relations between Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity To-day."
5. Address by Rev. Frederick Tower Galpin, D.D., Pastor First Baptist Church, Pittsburgh, "Fellowship beyond the Creeds."

Hardly has this war revealed a more beautifully liberal spirit than that of the late Chief Rabbi Abraham Bloch, of Lyons, who was serving with the Allied forces as a Jewish chaplain. He was killed on the battlefield while holding a crucifix to a dying Catholic soldier.

Liberal Jew and liberal Christian stand closer to each other than to any other existing creed, just as (so I venture to think) Judaism and Christianity are really more allied to each other than is either to any other of the great historical religions.—*C. G. Montefiore, Jew, England.*

Creeds and Confessions! High Church or the Low?
I cannot say; but you would vastly please us
If with some pointed scripture you could show
To which of these belonged the Saviour Jesus.
I think to all or none; not curious creeds
Or ordered forms of churchly rule he taught,
But soul of love that blossomed into deeds,
With human good and human blessing fraught.
On me nor Priest nor Presbyter, nor Pope,
Bishop, or Dean may stamp a party name;
But Jesus, with his largely human scope,
The service of my human life may claim.
Let prideful priests do battle about creeds,
The church is mine that does most Christ-like deeds.

—*John Stuart Blackie, Presbyterian.*

ILLUSTRATIVE READINGS.

THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL.

I belong to the Universal Church: nothing shall separate me from it. In saying this, however, I am no enemy to particular churches. In the present age of the world it is perhaps best that those who agree in theological opinions should worship together. I look on the various churches of Christendom with no feeling of enmity. The Romish Church is illustrated by great names. Her gloomy convents have often been brightened by fervent love to God and man. Her St. Louis, and Fénelon, and Massillon, and Cheverus; her missionaries who have carried Christianity to the ends of the earth; her sisters of charity who have carried relief and solace to the most hopeless want and pain; do not these teach us that in the Romish Church the Spirit of God has found a home? In the English Church we meet the names of Latimer, Hooker, Barrow, Leighton, Berkeley, and Heber; in the Dissenting Calvinistic Church, Baxter, Howe, Watts, Doddridge, and Robert Hall; among the Quakers, George Fox, William Penn, Robert Barclay, and our own Anthony Benezet and John Woolman; in the Anti-Trinitarian Church, John Milton, John Locke, Samuel Clarke, Price, and Priestley. To repeat these names does the heart good. They breathe a fragrance through the common air. They lift up the whole race to which they belonged. With the churches of which they were pillars or chief ornaments I have many sympathies; nor do I condemn the union of ourselves to these or any other churches whose doctrines we approve, provided that we do it without severing ourselves in the least from the Universal Church. On this point we cannot be too earnest. We must shun the spirit of sectarianism as from hell. We must shudder at the thought of shutting up God in any denomination. We must think no man the better for belonging to our communion; no man the worse for belonging to another. We must look with undiminished joy on goodness, though it shine forth from the most adverse sect. Christ's spirit must be equally dear and honored, no matter where manifested. To confine God's love or his good spirit to any party, sect, or name is to sin against the fundamental law of the kingdom of God, to break that living bond with Christ's Universal Church which is one of our chief helps to perfection. —*Dr. William Ellery Channing, Unitarian.*

The Church Universal is made up of all those whom God has "called out of the world, and worldly spirit, to walk in His Life and Light." This comprehensive and truly catholic church may have members both "among Heathen, Turks, Jews, and all of the several sorts of Christians, men and women of integrity and simplicity of heart, who, though blinded in some things in their understanding and perhaps burdened with the superstition and formality of the several sects in which they are engrossed, yet being upright in their hearts before the Lord, chiefly aiming and laboring to be delivered from iniquity, and loving to follow righteousness, are by the secret touches of this holy light in their souls enlivened and quickened, thereby secretly united to God, and there-through become true members of this catholic church.—*David Barclay, English Quaker, 17th Century.*

SECOND SESSION.

Wednesday Morning, March 7, at 10 o'clock,

AT THE NORTH SIDE UNITARIAN CHURCH, NORTH AVENUE AND RESACA PLACE, ALLEGHENY.

PRESENTATION OF THE AIMS AND WORK OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS.

Reports, Resolutions, and Testimonies; New Business. Brief Addresses by

J. Barnard Walton, General Secretary of the Advancement Committee of the Religious Society of Friends, Philadelphia,

Rev. Carl A. Voss, D.D., Pres. Evangel. Protest. Church of North America, Pittsburgh,

Rev. Minot O. Simons, of Cleveland, O., representing the American Unitarian Association,

Rev. Lee S. McCollester, D.D., President Universalist General Convention, Boston, Mass.,

Rabbi Dr. William Rosenau, Baltimore, President Central Conference of American Rabbis,

and others. Discussion.

I will set my face to the wind and will throw my handful of seed on high.—*Gaelic Rune.*

In the economy of God, no effort, however small, put forth for the right cause, fails of its effect. No voice, however feeble, lifted up for truth, ever dies amidst the confused noises of Time. Through discords of Sin and Sorrow, Pain and Wrong, it rises in deathless melody, whose notes of wailing are hereafter to be changed to those of triumph, as they blend with the Great Harmony of a reconciled Universe.—*John G. Whittier.*

There is one thing that is stronger than armies, and that is an idea whose time is come.—*Victor Hugo.*

A man is sufficient for himself; yet ten men, united in love, were capable of being and of doing what ten thousand singly would fail in.—*Thomas Carlyle.*

Wednesday Afternoon, March 7.

12.15 P.M. Lunch tendered by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce at the William Penn Hotel. Address by Oswald Garrison Villard of New York, and others.

2.00 P.M. "Seeing Pittsburgh"—a personally conducted tour for the delegates.

ILLUSTRATIVE READINGS.

My first wish is to see this plague to mankind (war) banished from the earth—to see the whole world in peace, and the inhabitants of it as one band of brothers striving who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind. —*George Washington.*

I abhor war and view it as the greatest scourge of mankind. I love peace and am anxious that we should give the world still another useful lesson, by showing them other modes of punishing injuries than by war, which is as much a punishment to the punisher as to the sufferer.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

There must be a just and settled peace, and we here in America must contribute the full force of our enthusiasm and of our authority as a nation to the organization of that peace upon world-wide foundations that cannot easily be shaken. —President Wilson.

You are thinking of Victory. I am thinking of the Peace which will follow it. I am not a soldier in the army of force, I am a soldier in the army of the spirit. I will not be a party to hatred. I will be just to all my enemies. In the midst of passion I wish to preserve the clarity of my vision, to understand and love everything. —*Romain Rolland.*

Lord Bryce, speaking at the University of London, said: "However much we may condemn reckless monarchs, and the ruthless caste that lives for war, the real source of war is the popular sentiment behind them. The lesson to be learned is, that the evil doctrines and deep-rooted passions, whence these evils spring, can only be removed by the slow and steady working of *spiritual* forces. What most is needed is the elimination of those feelings which breed jealousy and hatred and prompt men to defiance and aggression."

If you have a nation of men who have risen to that height of moral cultivation that they will not declare war or carry arms, for they have not so much madness left in their brains, you have a nation of lovers, of benefactors, of true, great, and able men. Let me know more of that nation; I shall not find them defenceless, with idle hands swinging at their sides. I shall find them men of love, honor, and truth; men of an immense industry; men whose influence is felt to the end of the earth; men whose very look and voice carry the sentence of honor and shame; and all forces yield to their energy and persuasion. Whenever we see the doctrine of peace embraced by a nation, we may be assured it will not be one that invites injury; but one, on the contrary, which has a friend in the bottom of the heart of every man, even of the violent and the base; one against which no weapon can prosper; one which is looked upon as the asylum of the human race, and has the tears and the blessings of mankind. —*Ralph Waldo Emerson.*

THIRD SESSION.

Wednesday Evening, March 7, at 8 o'clock,

AT EMORY METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Rev. Luther Freeman, Pastor.

Topic, "Looking Towards Peace."

Addresses by

Anna Garlin Spencer, Professor of Sociology and Ethics, Meadville Theological School; Vice-President Women's Peace Party.

Frederick Lynch, D.D., Secretary Church Peace Union of America; Editor *Christian Work and Evangelist,* New York City, on "The World After the War."

Oswald Garrison Villard, LL.D., of the *New York Evening Post,* on "Universal Compulsory Military Service in the United States."

IN JUSTIFICATION OF THE PRESENT WAR.

While the brute in man still asserts its lawless purpose, and indeed with an access of diabolical ingenuity unknown before, force must be met by force to prevent a worse catastrophe, and hold the field of growth and the ultimate dominion of those higher influences, truth and honor, righteousness and love. Thus it is no disloyalty to the heavenly vision, which leads a man, who believes absolutely in the Christian ideal and avows himself a humble disciple of the Prince of Peace, to feel nevertheless, that there are occasions when he is bound by the paramount claims of humanity to fight for the right. Eager for the service of love and a true citizenship of the kingdom of God on earth, he is yet compelled amid the sinister and brutal forces of the world to a sterner duty than any gentle pacifism can fulfil. That is the conviction in which a multitude of our people have accepted the burden and the sacrifices of this dreadful war, with no self-seeking, and no vainglory or insolent pride, but as a stern necessity, for righteousness' sake, as upholding justice in the earth and a true humanity.—*Rev. V. D. Davis,* in the London *Inquirer.*

Avoid overgrown military establishments, which are particularly hostile to republican liberties.—*Washington's Farewell Address.*

Every war, even for the nation that conquers, is nothing less than a misfortune.—*General von Moltke.*

Wars are not paid for at the time; the bill comes later.—*Benjamin Franklin.*

> . . . who overcomes
> By force hath overcome but half his foe.
>
> —*John Milton.*

Conquer your foe by force, and you increase his enmity. Conquer him by love, and you will reap no after-sorrow.—*Chinese Classics.*

ILLUSTRATIVE READINGS.

The cross lies on the sun and sunshine forms from heaven. Why should not we?—*Parsons Sermons.*

Either Christianity will accept the canons of honest men of modern training, or it is doomed to become in America what it is in Europe—a pastime and prompt of servitude.—*Goldwin Maitland.*

I have been driven so my knees many times by the realization that I had nowhere else to go.—*Abraham Lincoln.*

To one who said, "My desire is to know the world a little better than I found it," the poet Tennyson replied, "My business is for a new vision of God."

My personal sense of the personal God grows stronger as my mind matures on, for the whole of life seems but a single unfolding that requires the judging of a mighty life beneath.—*Charles E. M. Joad, D.D.*

Man is not placed in a world of mere ideas; the essential part of his being is in God. And it is in the Divine Idea, that all men must come for their abiding consciousness, and so their strongest Social Life has participated in the Infinite. . . . A true man knows upon his individual personality as a thought of the Deity; and what he represents—the deepest of his being—is to men as a purpose of God Himself. Whatever man may do, and however he may fail to know himself as a divine being, he himself, although his own accomplice, is sure and will seek to annihilate. Only when a Higher Power takes possession and opens him forward, and gives within him clear vital evidences that take up the whole of his life. All things are new, and beautiful, which have appeared to the world under the impression in which will appear until the end, have appeared and will appear through the Divine Idea, expressed through that character of the man.—*Parker.*

Amid the processes which become the more conscious the more they are brought about, there will remain the one absolute mystery, that the vital impulse of Consciousness, in every organism of any complexity and historical lineage, comes to each individual as a free gift from which all things proceed.—*Herbert Spencer.*

You have expressed my inmost conviction . . . that the universe is not the result of chance.—*Charles Darwin.*

Man is conscious of a universal soul within or behind his individual life, wherein, as in a firmament, the luminous orbs of reason, truth, justice, friendship, order and choice, shine. This universal soul he calls Wisdom. It is not mine or thine, but we are by it, we are in its presence and seen. . . . That which perpetually astonishes me and humbles me, is the reliance on Nature we will assert. Speak to the Creator. Speak back life to Him. And trust in the soul and sometimes contradict it for the keepsake of the Father.—*Emerson.*

FOURTH SESSION.

Thursday Morning, March 8, at 10 o'clock,

AT THE GERMAN EVANGELICAL PROTESTANT CHURCH, SMITHFIELD STREET.

Topic, "RELIGIOUS RECONSTRUCTION."

Addresses:

1. "A Revival of Religious Experience."
   By Rev. WILLIAM LAURENCE SULLIVAN. Minister of All Souls Church. New York City.
2. "The Need for a New Vision of God."
   By Rev. RICHARD W. BOYNTON. Minister First Unitarian Church. Buffalo. N.Y.
3. "The Religion of Jesus and the Modern World."
   By Rev. LEE S. MCCOLLESTER. Dean Crane Theological School. Tufts College. Boston.
4. "The Rebirth of the Immortal Hope."
   By ALFRED W. MARTIN. A.M., Assistant Leader Ethical Culture Society. New York City.

They that love beyond the world, cannot be separated by it. Death cannot kill what never dies. Nor can spirits ever be divided that love and live in the same Divine principle, the root and record of their friendship. If absence be not death, neither is theirs. Death is but crossing the world, as friends do the seas; they live in one another still. For they must needs be present, that love and live in that which is omnipresent. In this Divine glass, they see face to face; and their converse is free, as well as pure. This is the comfort of friends, that though they may be said to die, yet their friendship and society are, in the best sense, ever present, because immortal.—*William Penn.*

Death itself is nothing—a momentary pain, a swift dream out of which one awakes with reality of life, the flight of a bird through an arch of gloom into the sunshine beyond. Think nothing of it, think only that thus the vision we have seen in youth, in middle life, in age, shall be shaped into attainment with a fulness of joy. —*Rev. Stopford Brooke.*

A better day is coming. The kingdom of heaven is at hand. A purer Christianity, however slowly, is to take the place of that which bears but its name. Cannot we become heralds of this better day? Let our hearts bid it welcome. Let our lives reveal its beauty and its power.—*Dr. W. E. Channing.*

The idolatry of dogmas will pass away: Christianity, being rescued from the sectarianism and intolerance that have defaced it, will shine by its own moral splendor, and sublimated above all the sphere of controversy, will resume its rightful position as an ideal and not a system, as a person and not a creed.—*W. H. Lecky.*

ILLUSTRATIVE READINGS.

Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.—*Jesus.*

The conservation of human life and energy lies even nearer to our interest than the preservation from waste of our material resources. We ought to devote ourselves to meeting pressing demands of plain justice as earnestly as to the accomplishment of political and economic reforms. Social justice comes first. Law is the machinery for its realization and is vital only as it expresses and embodies it.—*Woodrow Wilson.*

My liberty ends when it begins to involve the possibility of ruin to my neighbor.—*John Stuart Mill.*

There is no simile which does greater violence to our hopes than that of "the melting-pot." We do not want to boil down all rare metals, all gems and craftsmanship of design which come to us into a common and meaningless mass. We need them to enrich our life, and must draw from each group its contribution to American life in craft and culture, art and ideals. —*Mrs. J. Fels, in The Survey.*

Luxurious emotions and aspirations which end as such are the merest travesty of religion. Going through forms of prayer and praise which do not end in service are the summit of blasphemy. Worship is preparation, aiming not to win the divine favor for us, but to win and keep us for divine service.

Why do we not do it? The task of putting an end to the brute method of settling difficulties between nations by "reeking gun and iron shard" calls for you—how few respond!

The cause of the suffering weak—the women, and above all, the children—calls for you. Thousands of tired little ones are driving tired fingers to tasks too long and hard even for their elders—are stunting bodies and souls. Some girl like your sister, or daughter—is giving up the too hard battle for a livelihood and for the little girlish adornments and pleasures rightly hers—is giving up the struggle to sell herself in the market place for a few brief months of what looks like life and love. How little we care that she has fallen, and how little we help her to rise. And the boy too—just coming into manhood, with life pulsing strong in his veins! We set him to a monotony of labor with long hours, little hope, and no stimulation of creative tasks. And we set drink traps and sex traps, baited with light and comradeship—we set these traps at every corner to catch him. They do catch him—and how little we care. "Vested interests," "party expediency," a dozen excuses, a score of pretenses serve to hide from us victims on the rack of modern wage slavery, and to muffle the cries of human agony going up to God from slum and tenement and sweat shop and factory. Have you enlisted and begun to try at least to *know*, looking on to the day when you can *do*?

The barbarism of our prison systems cries to heaven—have the echoes reached you? As we gather, clean and comfortable with the clean and comfortable of our kind to revel in so-called religious emotion—do our hearts go out to those in chains? Chains of the body and the chains of habit? Who said "They who are well need not a physician, but they who are sick"? Who said "I am come

FIFTH SESSION.

Thursday Afternoon, March 8, at 2 o'clock,

AT THE PARISH HOUSE OF TRINITY CHURCH, EPISCOPAL.

Rev. Edward S. Travers, Rector.

Topic, "Facing the New Social Order."

Addresses by

Rev. Leon O. Williams, Minister First Universalist Church, Buffalo, N.Y.,
Morris Knowles, C.E.,
and others. Discussion.

---

to the *lost sheep"?* Who said "Neither do I condemn thee"? Only few and slow beginnings have been made in the Christian treatment of criminals.

It is not worth while to go on with the interminable list of the causes that lack assistance and the wrongs that need resistance. But it is essential to recognize one thing especially: that in all this the thing needed is not charity, but justice—and that justice is *whatever is best,* alike for society and the individual as a member of society. Charity is the merest temporary expedient at the best—the doling out of relief, college settlements, municipal lodging houses and the like have in them not the slightest promise of the future except in making the problem clear and forcing it home to men of good will. Justice and fair play is the only solution. The freeing of every opportunity for life and labor is the central problem of the Christian religion.

The great religious duty of our time then is the duty of the citizen of the democracy. The making over of our barbarous industrial materialism into a real democracy is just the task of the Lord's Prayer—to make the kingdom come on earth.—*Jesse H. Holmes.*

No matter what creed we profess or ignore, no matter what our political affiliations, we may all unite on the common ground of social service.—*Mrs. Edward A. Mandel, of New York, at the National Conference of Catholic Charities, Sept. 19, 1916.*

Despair of humanity is distrust of God.—*Goethe.*

The most important question now confronting the American people is the race problem, as it is disclosed to us in the negro question in both the South and North of the United States, the regulation of European immigration, and the attitude of our government and people towards Asiatic nations.—*David Starr Jordan, quoted in a British journal.*

At no time have the disadvantages of the sectarian divisions of the Church been more apparent than when the call has come for a common policy or a united utterance concerning such problems as modern industry now presents.—*Christian Commonwealth.*

ILLUSTRATIVE READINGS.

In the evolution of society it has been ordained that love of country should precede the wider love of mankind. The heart pours out its feeling first on family and kindred, then on country, and then on humanity. First the home, then the flag, and then the cross.—*Thomas Starr King.*

Nationality and humanity are equally sacred. To forget humanity is to suppress the aim of our labors; to cancel the nation is to suppress the instrument by which to achieve the aim.—*Joseph Mazzini.*

One flag, one land, one heart, one hand,
One nation evermore!

—*Oliver Wendell Holmes.*

"Not the mere holding of a great flag unfurled,
But making it the goodliest in the world."

National hate is strongest and most violent in the lower stages of culture. But there is a stage where it completely disappears, where one stands above nations and where one regards the weal or woe of a neighbor people as one's own.—*Goethe.*

To deride patriotism marks impoverished blood, but to extol it as an ideal or an impulse above truth and justice, at the cost of the general interests of humanity, is far worse.—*John Morley, in "Politics and History."*

The safety of the weak nations in the presence of the strong is the best test of international morality.—*W. H. Lecky.*

Among all vain-glorious men he who is vain-glorious about his nationality is the completest fool.—*Herder.*

To die for one's country is fine, but to live for one's country is better.—*Montalembert.*

Patriotism has expanded in the course of history from devotion to clan to devotion to nation. There is where we are to-day. Is this to be its final form? Is the state the ultimate form of political organization, and are its interests to be supreme? On this question hangs the future peace of the world. If the interests of each state regardless of the interests of other states is to be the final appeal to patriotism, then might will make right and cataclysms like the present one will repeat themselves through the centuries.

Patriotism to-day is simply a high form of group morality; it is not universal morality. It is a virtue in so far as it checks and elevates a still narrower form of group consciousness; it is a positive vice in so far as its intense devotion to nation stands in the way of a wider, a universal morality which should consist in devotion to the highest interests of humanity as a whole.—*Thomas M. Balliet, in "The Christian Register."*

"This one is my country-man: this other is a stranger"—so think the men of narrow mind and heart. The noble soul regards the whole world as kin.—*Institutes of Manu (Hindu).*

The watchword of the future must be tolerance, human fraternity, placed above doctrines and differing faiths.—*Romain Rolland.*

SIXTH AND LAST SESSION.

Thursday Evening, March 8, at 7.30 o'clock,

AT FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH, ELLSWORTH AND MOREWOOD AVENUES.

Rev. L. Walter Mason, D.D., Minister.

Topic, "Nationality and World Brotherhood."

Addresses by

S. K. Ratcliffe, Esq., of the *Manchester Guardian*, England, and Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Litt. D., Minister Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

9.00 P.M. Brief Devotional Service.

Closing words by the President of the National Federation, Prof. Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D., and Mr. Julian Kennedy of Pittsburgh.

A VISION OF THE FUTURE.

Amid all the misunderstanding, passion and violence that attend this terrible struggle between the nations, the conviction is dawning in the souls of high-minded men and women throughout our distracted Christendom that whatever be the folly or misfortunes of any single generation there are certain spiritual values which can never be destroyed. The pursuit of truth, the practice of virtue, the enjoyment of the beautiful, the love of our fellows, the worship of God,—these ideal interests in which the glory and hope of our race so largely consist, are not subject to the idle wrath of man or the vicissitudes of a military campaign. They are eternal verities, as firmly placed in the spirit's skies as are the lights of heaven! Recent correspondence with eminent scholars in Great Britain, Germany, France, and a dozen other warring countries, reveals that there is awaking a more inclusive and pacific spirit among them. The conviction is reasserting itself that intellectual and spiritual issues must again assume their rightful place as the paramount interests of human life. Learning, philosophy, science, art, ethics, religion,—these are not ephemeral in their nature, or limited by boundaries of nationality or race, much less are they subject to the arbitrament of sword or cannon. They will remain forever the common aims of the higher kind of men and women in all nations. Therefore, when the war-drums beat no longer, the beating of the heart of humanity will again be listened to; when the gory war-flags of the nations are furled, the white flag of universal peace will receive the homage of a better instructed world, and free-minded, large-hearted, religious men and women of all countries will once more renew their severed friendships, and by united efforts advance the triumph of reason, freedom, and progress in religion, the brotherhood of man, and the peaceful federation of mankind.—*Charles W. Wendte.*

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS.

THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT. Proceedings and Papers of the First Congress of the National Federation of Religious Liberals, held in Philadelphia. Edited by CHARLES W. WENDTE, D.D. Boston. 1909. 287 pp. Bound volume. Price 30 cents, postpaid.

THE UNITY OF LIFE. Proceedings and Papers of the Third Congress of the National Federation of Religious Liberals, held in New York. Edited by HENRY W. WILBUR. Philadelphia. 1911. 216 pp. Price 30 cents, postpaid.

FREEDOM AND THE CHURCHES. The Contributions of American Churches to Civil and Religious Liberty. Ten addresses (given at the Rochester Fourth Congress of the National Federation of Religious Liberals). The following well-known writers take part in the symposium: Professor Walter Rauschenbusch (Baptist), Professor Williston Walker (Congregationalist), Dr. O. E. Janney (Friend), Dr. H. G. Enelow (Jew), Dr. Lewis M. Lounsbury (Methodist), Dr Paul M. Strayer (Presbyterian), Dr. Wm. Elliot Griffis (Reformed), Dr. L. Walter Mason (Unitarian), Dr. Isaac M. Atwood (Universalist), Edwin D. Mead (Religious Radical). The volume has been edited by Dr. C. W. Wendte. Publishers: The American Unitarian Association, Boston. Special Federation price 75 cents, postpaid.

Proceedings of the Fifth Congress, at Philadelphia, February, 1915. Sent free on application.

Proceedings of the Seventh Congress, at Pittsburgh, March, 1917.

The foregoing publications may be procured from the Secretary of the Congress.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS.

An Appreciation.

The Seventh Congress of the National Federation of Religious Liberals was held, by invitation of liberal clergymen and churches of Pittsburgh, Pa., in that city on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of April, 1917. The program of sixteen pages which had been prepared and sent in advance to the members of the Federation and the churches co-operating was impressive by the largeness and timeliness of the topics presented for discussion and the representative quality and ability of the speakers. No feature of it, however, was more significant or more fully realized the ideals of the Federation than the list of the local committee which extended the invitation. It consisted of twenty-eight clergymen, including the Chancellor of the University, belonging to fifteen different denominations. It shows what can be done in almost any American community to secure an expression of fellowship beyond the lines of sect and creed, provided the avowedly liberal ministers and churches in said city, through the weight of their characters and the largeness of their spirit, possess the confidence and good-will of the religious community.

Pittsburgh has long been noted for its conservatism in religion and politics. It was an agreeable surprise to learn how hospitable to differences in theological opinion, how truly liberal many of its clergy and laity are. This expression of sympathy is due very largely to the long and irenic ministries in that city of such well-known liberals as Dr. L. Walter Mason, for seventeen years past the beloved minister of the First Unitarian Church, Dr. J. Leonard Levy, who for an equal period has been rabbi of the great Reform Jewish Congregation Rodeph Shalom and a power for the higher interests of the city, and Dr. Carl A. Voss, pastor of the German American Evangelical Protestant Church, which includes over six thousand souls in its parish register, and a graduate and trustee of the Meadville Theological School, which has reason to be proud of his devoted labors and large influence.

To the regard felt for these men, and their ready assumption of the burden of the work needed to assure local co-operation with the Congress, must be chiefly ascribed its success. Recognition is due also to Rev. Charles E.

Snyder of the North-Side Unitarian Church, who, as secretary of the local committee, displayed executive ability and intelligent comprehension of the aims of the Federation.

The meetings were held under great disadvantage as regards the weather. The heaviest snowstorm of the season, followed by a sudden thaw, and this again by freezing cold, deterred many from attendance, yet the opening session in the splendid Hebrew Temple found a responsive audience of seven hundred and fifty people to greet the Congress. The introductory service conducted by Dr. Levy was most impressive. His reading of the beautiful prayers of the Jewish liturgy and welcome to the ministers, fourteen of whom sat on the rostrum with him, was like a benediction invoked upon the pacific and friendly purpose which brought them together. The President of the Federation, Professor Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D., of Swarthmore College, a member of the Society of Friends, speaking without notes but with clarity and charm, gave a social interpretation to the term "religious liberal," and plead for greater devotion to human service, social justice, and international peace and good-will. The Secretary, Rev. Charles W. Wendte, D.D., followed with a definition of the spirit and aim of the Federation in striving for a fellowship based, not on uniformity of creed or rite, but on moral sympathies, mutual forbearance and respect, and a recognition of the human and social work men of widely differing faiths might unitedly engage in. Rabbi Dr. William Rosenau of Baltimore, president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, spoke with fire and force on the relations which Reform Judaism should have to this movement for larger fellowship. The concluding address was given by Rev. Frederick Tower Gailpin, D.D., pastor of the First Baptist Church of Pittsburgh, who gave a genial welcome to the delegates and affirmed his faith in religious freedom, progress, and charity. Nearly a hundred new members were added to the Federation at this meeting which auspiciously opened the Congress.

At the business session held the next morning in the North-Side Unitarian Church the usual reports from Secretary and Treasurer were accepted. A balance of $351.50 was reported on hand. It was also announced that the Universalist, Liberal Friend, and Unitarian fellowships had officially recognized and joined the Federation, and other bodies were considering the matter.

Brief addresses were made by J. Barnard Walton, the new General Secretary of the Advancement Committee of the Religious Society of Friends, Philadelphia, by Rev. Carl A. Voss, D.D., President of the German Evangelical Churches of North America, Rev. Lee S. McCollester, D.D., President of the Universalist General Convention, and Rev. Minot O. Simons of Cleveland, representing the Unitarian body. Rev. G. Herbert Ekins of the Plymouth Congregational Church, Rev. George B. Richards, Emanuel Protestant Episcopal Church, Rev. William A. Prosser, United People's Church, and others of the local clergy also addressed the meeting, expressing their sympathy with the general purposes of the Federation.

The following resolutions were adopted:—

The National Federation of Religious Liberals met in Pittsburgh March 6–8, 1917, representing many and widely differing organizations, with many and widely differing details of faith, find side by side with these differences a great body of common ideals and common purposes.

1. We believe that society exists for man and not for the things he makes.

We believe, therefore, that in all industries the interests of the worker should precede the interests of the work.

That things which can be produced only at the expense of human deterioration should not be produced at all.

2. We believe that the natural resources of the world belong essentially to mankind and their title cannot be alienated.

We believe, therefore, that society as organized in governments should see that the actual wealth of the world is held and used for the benefit of mankind and not for any restricted group.

We deplore the growth of a caste system based on wealth, often growing out of undue appropriation of natural resources.

3. Since our interest is in mankind it cannot be restricted to race or nation. We do not desire the advantage of any one people at the expense of any other. Reasonable conference, not conflict, must govern the mutual relation of nations. War can only confuse their mutual understandings and delay the accomplishment of their purposes. We strongly endorse the patient efforts of the President of the United States to preserve this nation at peace with the rest of the world and his prophetic utterances for an international understanding to prevent future wars.

4. We desire to express once more our central conviction that true and enduring religious fellowship cannot be brought about by uniformity either of belief or worship. Oneness of moral sympathy, united testimony for justice and righteousness, and co-operation for human and social service are possible beyond the lines of sect or creed. Not by the amalgamation of existing forms and doctrines, or the general acceptance of an "irreducible minimum" of belief and practice; only by the voluntary federation of the religious forces of the community, with mutual respect and sympathy, for united testimony and service amidst large varieties of thought and church connection, can real and effective religious fellowship be established; for while "intellectual sympathies are limited, moral sympathies are universal."

The visiting members of the Federation had been invited to attend the monthly luncheon of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce at the William Pitt Hotel, and to furnish the speaker for the occasion. Before a gathering of over five hundred leading business men of the city Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard of the New York Evening *Post* spoke on the present duty of hesitation, calmness of spirit, and a patriotism guided by good judgment and a large-hearted interpretation of human and world-wide interests. Incidentally he defended the right of the minority of twelve Senators in Congress to their own opinion and course of action, and exposed the dangers in the military measure now before Congress to establish universal compulsory service in the United States, involving as he showed, the largest standing army of any nation in the world and the biggest navy.

It was a brave thing to bring up this subject, for Pittsburgh is a great centre of munition manufacture, of huge capitalized industries, and strong pro-ally and pro-war sentiment, but such was the moral earnestness, the persuasiveness and tact of the speaker and his patriotic spirit that he was listened to with the greatest courtesy and even applauded. It was a tribute to both the citizens of Pittsburgh and the one who addressed them. Among those present were some twenty trustees of the Meadville Theological School, who were holding an important session in Pittsburgh at the time and participated, so far as able, in the meetings of the Congress.

In the evening at the Emory Methodist Episcopal Church, another large audience, despite the inclement weather, had gathered to listen to three fine addresses on World Peace, by three speakers—Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, Vice-President of the Woman's Peace Party, Rev. Dr. Frederick Lynch, of New York, Secretary of the Church Peace Union of America, and Oswald Garrison Villard, LL.D. Nothing could have been more gracious than the welcome and introductions of Rev. Dr. Luther Freeman, pastor of the church. Here, too, new members were added to the Federation.

On the morning of the 8th the session was held at the Smithfield German Evangelical Church, a large and beautiful Gothic structure now in the heart of the mercantile section of the city and soon to be surrendered to the inroads of business. A property valuation of a million and a half dollars makes it too costly a luxury for the church to maintain any longer for its private use. The

religious services, which introduced every session of the Congress, were conducted by Rev. Wyatt Brown of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Ascension and Rev. S. M. Lindsay of the Baptist Church, the full choir and organ of Dr. Voss's church assisting. Three papers on "Religious Reconstruction" were read to a deeply interested audience of one hundred and fifty persons, many of them clergymen and students of theology. Rev. Richard W. Boynton of Buffalo spoke on "The Need for a New Vision of God." It was a remarkable and valuable paper, which, we trust, will be heard in Boston during the coming anniversaries.

Dr. Lee S. McCollester, Dean of Tufts College Divinity School, and one of the leaders of the Congress, followed with a fine scholarly paper on "The Religion of Jesus and the Modern World." Mr. Alfred W. Martin, A.M., assistant leader of the Ethical Culture Society of New York City, and a speaker of unusual attractiveness and persuasive power, spoke on "The Rebirth of the Immortal Hope," which he based mainly on the universality and eternity of the ethical nature of man.

These addresses are printed in the annual report of the Federation, together with other addresses and proceedings at the Congress. This report will be sent to all members of the society. Incidentally it should be mentioned that the Pittsburgh daily and weekly journals gave unusually full and instructive notices and reports of the Congress.

The afternoon session was held at the parish house of Trinity Episcopal Church, another down-town temple. Its rector, Rev. Edward S. Travers, conducted the opening service, Rev. Leon O. Williams, minister of the First Universalist Church, Buffalo, read a thoughtful, carefully prepared paper on "Facing the New Social Order." It dealt mainly with the more thorough application of the modern science of psychology to social problems. The papers and addresses that followed were of a practical order. Mr. Morris Knowles, a prominent civil engineer, and member of the Pittsburgh Survey commission, spoke on "The Social Responsibility of Industry," and Dr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones of Chicago on "The Spirit of Abraham Lincoln and American Society." Dr. Oberholtzer, Secretary of the State Board of Film Censors, gave an interesting account of the moral aspects of the motion picture. Seventy per cent. of the films submitted to his board were melodramatic, that is, they

dealt with crime and sex problems, twenty per cent. were slap-stick comedy, usually violent and vulgar, ten per cent. were artistic and instructive. The tendency was to make the films ever more vulgar, violent, and indecent. Recently child-birth scenes had been offered the censors. Mr. J. J. O'Connor of the Pittsburgh Child Welfare Society gave his experience in trying to induce the motion-picture houses to take into consideration the moral influence of their productions on the children who attended them. Mr. Caplan told of the campaign against films inculcating sectarian hatred and prejudice. Dr. C. W. Wendte reported on recent British and German legislation to save childhood from the demoralizing effects of the movie. Rev. F. S. C. Wicks of Indianapolis advised that parents were the best censors, and advocated an earnest and concerted effort by the churches to arouse their parishioners and the general community to the evils which attend the cinema as now conducted.

The final session of the Congress was held at the first Unitarian Church, Dr. L. Walter Mason conducting the service. It was a dismal night without, but within the handsome church a goodly audience had gathered to listen to two addresses on Nationality and World-Brotherhood by S. K. Ratcliffe of England and Dr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones of Chicago. Both were admirable in their respective way and supplemented each other. The meeting closed with an address, terse and witty, by Jonan Kennedy, Esq., of Pittsburgh, eminent as a citizen and designer of the great steel plants that encircle the city. President Holmes and Dr. Wendte responded briefly on behalf of the Federation. The latter gave the closing benediction, and the Congress came to a happy ending.

It had again shown conclusively that the National Federation has a unique and important mission in the religious life of the United States, and also left behind pleasant memories which are to be perpetuated in Pittsburgh by a recently formed Liberal Ministers Club. It consists of some twenty-five ministers of fifteen different denominations including the Jewish fellowship. The meetings are to be held every six weeks and will consist of a common meal, a paper and discussion. Dr. J. Leonard Levy, who suggested the Club, is its first chairman. No better result of the Congress could have been desired.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF
RELIGIOUS LIBERALS.
7th Congress, at Pittsburgh, Pa., March 6-8, 1917.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY FOR 1916-17.

The last general meeting of this Federation for the transaction of its business and the consideration of its aims, methods, and opportunities for service was held on February 21, 1915, in connection with its Fifth Congress, which was held in the Friends Meeting House on Race and North 15th Streets, Philadelphia, in that week.

This session was an eventful one in the annals of our association. Although its proceedings were shadowed by the recent death of its able and beloved President, Henry Wilbur of the Society of Friends, one of the founders of the Federation and always its wise counsellor and devoted advocate, and although it met in Philadelphia during the very week in which Rev. William A. Sunday was convulsing the religious community with his picturesque revival, the attendance at the nine sessions of our congress was large, the thirty-five addresses by men and women of prominence in the liberal Christian and liberal Jewish world were able and scholarly. It was pervaded by that beautiful spirit of reasonableness, fairness, tolerance, sympathy, and good-will, and a religious fellowship beyond the lines of sect and creed, which it is the particular mission of the National Federation of Religious Liberals to promote in the American community. The newspaper mention of the Philadelphia congress was unusually full, owing to special efforts to this end made by the local committee, while an edition of 800 pamphlet copies of the proceedings, with abstracts of the papers read, prepared by the Secretary, has since been nearly all distributed among the members and friends of the congress and the leading college and public libraries of the United States.

Unfortunately, mainly through the want of a proper understanding as to expenditures between the national and local committees, this Philadelphia congress left our Federation some $300 in debt. All bills, however,

were promptly paid by the Secretary-Treasurer. Eighteen months later he was able to report that the income from memberships and gifts had made up the deficiency and left a small balance in hand. This lack of funds, however, prevented the holding of another congress in 1916, as had been planned. In the mean time the work of the congress, though financially crippled, was not suspended. The presence of a number of prominent liberals on the Pacific Coast during the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in the summer of 1915 afforded an opportunity to hold at Oakland, Cal., on August 29, a congress of three meetings, under the auspices of the World's Fair. The Free Religious Association of America co-operated by paying half the expenses. This congress was very successful, the large Unitarian Church in Oakland being filled on Sunday morning, afternoon, and evening with a crowded auditory, while the speaking and spirit of the occasion were in line with the aspirations and traditions of our society. President David Starr Jordan, Professor John W. Buckham, D.D., of the Pacific (Congregational) Theological School, President Dr. Joseph Swain of Swarthmore College, Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, Professor Ferdinand Buisson of France, Revs. Clay MacCauley, D.D., and D. Ebina of Tokio, J. Kasai, also of Tokio, Mrs. May Wright Sewall, Revs. Samuel D. Crothers, D.D., George R. Dodson, D.D., Rabbi M. Friedlander, B.G., D. Mukerji (of Brahmanic faith), and others made addresses on and illustrated The Fellowship of the Spirit, Interdenominational Good-will, The Sympathy of Religions, and World Brotherhood. This congress paid for itself and left a small balance for our treasury.

The lull in its outward activities gave opportunity for a better organization of the Federation. For some time past it had become apparent that a more representative and effective participation of the so-called liberal denominations of the United States was desirable, after the model set by the Federal Council of the Disciples of Christ in America in federating some thirty Protestant sects of the country for the support of its activities. The congress at Philadelphia instructed its new President, Professor Jesse H. Holmes, to appoint a committee for this purpose, as well as to prepare a set of by-laws for the Federation. By invitation this committee met at Swarthmore, Pa., on May 20, 1915. There were present ten gentlemen representing five different liberal associations, President Jesse H. Holmes and Henry Ferris, editor

of the *Friends' Intelligencer*, who represented the Liberal Friends; Rev. Frank O. Hall, D.D., of New York City, and Dr. J. Clarence Lee, representing the Universalist body; Professor Morris Jastrow, Ph.D., of the University of Pennsylvania, and Mr. George O'Dell, representing the American Ethical Union; Rabbis Berkowitz and Krauskopf of the Reform Jewish congregations; and Revs. C. E. St. John and C. W. Wendte, D.D., who were delegated by the Unitarian body. Letters expressing interest and promising co-operation were also received from prominent members of the liberal German Evangelical churches of America, the Free Religious Association of America, from Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones of the Congress of Religion, from Professor Anna Garlin Spencer of the Meadville Theological School, who made particularly valuable suggestions, and others. The meeting proved a most harmonious one. New Articles of Organization were drawn up, providing that hereafter, in addition to the individual memberships which thus far have made up the constituency of the Federation, there shall be official representatives appointed by various liberal denominations and bodies in sympathy with the purposes of the society and desiring to co-operate in it; each to be represented in its Central Council by two official delegates, in addition to the nine members chosen from the Federation at large. A committee was appointed to put itself into communication with the various religious and ethical bodies referred to, and to invite their official participation hereafter in the work of the Federation. Plans were outlined for a greater usefulness for the Federation in the future.

The proposed by-laws were printed and mailed by the Secretary to all the members of the Federation for referendum vote. A large number of answers were returned, nearly all favorable.

At a called meeting of the Federation held February 21, 1916, at the Friends Building in Philadelphia, Mr. Fletcher Clark acting as Secretary, the new by-laws were put into execution by the election of the following officers:

President.

Professor Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D., of Swarthmore College, Pa.

Secretary.

Charles W. Wendte, D.D., 165 Hunnewell Avenue, Newton, Mass., to whom applications for membership and communications may be addressed.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

Elizabeth Powell Bond, Society of Friends, Philadelphia, Pa.
Samuel A. Eliot, D.D., President American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.
Daniel Evans, D.D., Professor Andover Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.
George H. Ferris, D.D., Pastor First Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
Morris Jastrow, Ph.D., Professor University of Pennsylvania (Ethical Culture Society).
Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Litt.D., Minister Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.
Lee S. McCollester, D.D., Universalist, Dean Crane Theological School, Tufts College, Mass.
Henry Mottet, D.D., Rector Church of the Holy Communion, New York City.
Lucia Ames Mead, National Secretary Women's Peace Party, Boston, Mass.
William Rosenau, D.D., President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Joseph Swain, LL.D., Friend, President Swarthmore College, Pa.
Ambrose White Vernon, D.D., Minister Harvard Congregational Church, Brookline, Mass.

Council.

Professor Jesse H. Holmes, Ph.D., Swarthmore, Pa.
Charles W. Wendte, D.D., Newton, Mass.
Dr. O. Edward Janney, Baltimore, Md.
Henry Berkowitz, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. J. Herman Randall, New York.
Professor Anna Garlin Spencer, Meadville, Pa.
S. Burns Weston, Philadelphia, Pa.
J. Clarence Lee, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Carl A. Voss, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.

The task remained to secure the adhesion of the liberal denominations referred to, together with the annual contribution of one hundred dollars to the treasury of the Federation which this involved. A long period of correspondence, personal interviews, and the co-operation of friends ensued. Large bodies move slowly even when their attitude is friendly. We are able to report to-day that three of the denominations—the Society of (Liberal) Friends, the Universalists, and the Unitarians—have taken the action referred to, have appointed two representatives each to serve on our council, and have each paid into our treasury the sum of one hundred dollars. The following are the denominational delegates thus appointed: For the Friends, J. Barnard Walton, Philadelphia, Pa., and Henry Ferris; for the Universalists, Frank O. Hall, D.D., New York City, and Rev. Henry R. Rose, D.D., Newark, N.J.; and for the Unitarians, Rev. Minot O. Simons, Cleveland, Ohio, and Mrs.

William C. Gannett, Cambridge, Mass. The Reform Jews have the matter still under advisement. At their last general conference the question of formally uniting with the Federation was left to their Executive Committee for consideration and report. The American Ethical Union participated in the reorganization of our Federation through two of its most prominent members, Professor Morris Jastrow and Mr. George O'Dell. Dr. Jastrow also accepted as one of our Vice-Presidents. Dr. Felix Adler, however, could not see the way clear to the proposed official participation at present, though without prejudice to future action in the matter. We are pleased to have with us as one of the speakers at our present congress Mr. Alfred W. Martin, the assistant leader of the New York Ethical Society, while Mr. S. Burns Weston, the leader of the Philadelphia Ethical Society, is a member of our council.

The Secretary has acted as Treasurer also for the past two years, but must soon ask to be relieved of the duties of both these positions, while retaining as before his interest in the ideals and work of the Federation. The time has come when with an assured income from memberships and denominational appropriations it will be possible to engage the services of a young and active man as secretary who shall devote himself to promoting the aims and work of the association and shall be paid a modest stipend for his services. This is the next step in the evolution of our purpose to which our attention should be directed.

In October last the Secretary made a three weeks' trip to the Middle West, without expense to our Society, which was largely devoted to furthering the interests of the Federation. In Pittsburgh and Cincinnati especially he found warm co-operation. Liberal friends of many denominations in both cities assured him of their readiness to entertain the next congress of the Federation. The Chambers of Commerce of these and half a dozen other Western cities have extended a welcome to us. It was thought best to accept for the present year the hospitable invitation of our liberal friends in Pittsburgh. The composition of the local committee with its truly gratifying representation of fifteen denominations through twenty-eight of their pastors, and the spirit and energy with which the arrangements have been made for our reception and to secure us a hearing, testify to the wisdom of our decision. Perhaps our Cincinnati friends will be

willing to welcome us to their city and churches a year hence.

The loss by death during the past year of one of the most deeply interested and efficient members of our committee, Rev. Charles E. St. John, D.D., of Philadelphia, minister of the First Unitarian Church in that city, is deeply to be deplored. Few among us gave better counsel or rendered more generous, helpful service. His spirit will long influence our councils and our work.

Another eminent member who has passed away was Mrs. Anna Rice Powell, widow of Aaron M. Powell, who with her husband was active in the anti-slavery and other great causes in American life. A member of the Society of Friends, she was a woman of lofty character, gentle manners, consecrated labors, and deep religious faith.

The past two years have been attended by the consolidating and strengthening of our association. May the fruitage be shown in increased effectiveness hereafter in the cause for which it was created:—to further religious fellowship beyond the lines of sect and creed, and enlarge and deepen the religious life in our hearts, our characters, and the community.

C. W. W.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1916-17.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS

IN ACCOUNT WITH

CHARLES W. WENDTE, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

RECEIPTS, 1916–17.

From Individual Memberships and Gifts, January 15, 1916, to January 18, 1917	$279.00
June 23, 1916. Contribution Universalist General Convention for 1916	100.00
December 18, 1916. Contribution of the General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends for 1916	100.00
January 18, 1917. Contribution American Unitarian Association for 1916	100.00
	$579.00

EXPENDITURES.

March 8, 1916. Geo. H. Ellis Co., printing Circular Appeal to Members	$19.25
Bank Charges, collecting checks	1.11
Typewriting	1.60
March 10, 1916. Stamps (for renewal of memberships)	5.00
March 20, 1916. Two new Membership Certificate Books	4.00
April 25–December 18, 1916. Postage	6.05
June 5, 1916. Paid Balance due Treasurer from 1915 Account	190.43
Jan. 18, 1917. Balance on Hand	351.56
	$579.00

ADDRESSES
AT THE
OPENING SESSION OF THE CONGRESS.

A BASIS FOR UNITY.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, JESSE H. HOLMES, PH.D.

When in the course of human events, a group of men and women gathers itself together under a special name, a decent respect for the understanding and opinion of its fellow-men demands that it shall in some measure explain the label it assumes. I shall therefore undertake briefly to indicate the meaning of the word "liberal," under which name we are here assembled.

"Liberal" is not to be contrasted with either "orthodox" or with "conservative." One is "orthodox" when he is right, and the term may therefore properly include pretty much all mankind, at least as it views itself. All of us, I trust, are as nearly right in our opinions as we know how to be; or, if we are not, our proper label is not "liberal," but "hypocrite." So also is every honest man a conservative, in so far that he would conserve those things which he recognizes to be of value to humanity, and he is also an iconoclast, in that he would destroy that which is evil or outgrown.

It cannot be claimed that "liberals" are always "radicals," since it is not given to many to get at the roots of things; and it may be remarked that the figure of speech is a rather unfortunate one, since "getting at the roots" of live things generally means killing them. A better figure perhaps would assert the freedom of the liberal in gathering the wholesome fruits of the ages wherever and under whatever name they may be found. Neither is the "liberal" an extremist. Going to extremes is usually or often the result of mere ignorance. Those ideals which have been implanted by the experience and "common sense of most" are usually deeply founded, meeting some real need of human nature, and are not lightly to be condemned. It is a besetting sin of many who mistakenly call themselves "liberals" to shut their eyes to fundamental truths hidden in the false verbiage of the cults they must oppose. Most things are not black or white, but either a shade of gray or touched with

special and misleading beauty in the half-light of prismatic color.

But if the liberal is none of these, what is he? He is a free man of good-will: one who will endure much

> "Rather than in silence shrink
> From the truth he needs must think."

It includes all those who valiantly "speak in hard words the truth of to-day" and demand like opportunity for all others. It includes all those who, if they yield to authority of institution, creed, or book, do so freely of their own choice and judgment, and demand like freedom for all others.

The foundations of our unity cannot be likeness of opinion, or unity of phrase. These things are narrowly personal and depend much on accidents of heredity and environment. But beyond the rather empty unity of free speech, free thought, and free life—limited only by like freedom for all others—there is a unity of purpose which, I believe, is great enough to include all those who call themselves liberals. This is no small and temporary end, but rather one running through the ages as an increasing purpose, widening with the process of the suns. It has made itself felt among lands, peoples, religions, and philosophies widely severed in time and space. It has been foreseen in the vision of seer and prophet; it has been worked out painfully in the ideals and systems of sages and philosophers. Its accomplishment has been variously located according to the faith or unfaith of dreamer or thinker, in his own land, in distant communities, in ideal and pictured islands, in a new earth, or in a remote and ill-defined heaven after death; but, however defined and wherever located, it has been essentially the ideal of an ennobled and perfected humanity in an uplifted and perfected community. It has involved a freedom from outward tyranny of dictators and despots, and a new and glorified service of the ideal ordered from within.

The Old Testament prophet looked for it in Judea, under the rule of a Davidic king; the apocalyptist prefigured a transformed earth with a specially created ruler; and the early Christian church looked for a New Jerusalem let down from heaven, with Jesus enthroned, a vague ideal which the modern church has half-heartedly adopted and lazily transferred to a life after death. Plato presents a painfully detailed "Republic," St. Augustine a "City of God," Campanella a "City of the Sun," Bacon

a "New Atlantis," Moore a "Utopia." Mr. Bellamy dashes far ahead and is "Looking Backward," while Mr. Wells stands back and looks more or less hopefully forward. All alike see in their several ways the perfected life of man in a perfected nation. Moreover, our present social order assumes such perfected nationality as its practical purpose. Universal education can be justified only on the supposition that it will supply an improved citizenship. Democratic institutions imply a faith that men desire the general good and can be trusted to plan for it. Cannot all men of good-will unite in this world task? Will not all alike find that this service leads in the direction of their formulated and desired ends? Is there not here a simplicity amid the complexities? Surely we can agree in the unselfish demand for general justice and fair play: that none shall be handicapped, none starved and stunted, none checked and thwarted in the interests of more fortunate fellows; that none shall gain by the loss of others, but only by the service of others.

That this is no impossible vision let us realize by what we have attained already in this our democracy. Taking even the extreme statement that *love* is the fulfilling of the law, have we not gone far toward the goal? *Love* is a very much overworked word. It often stands for a very selfish sentiment, and usually for a very exclusive one. But applied to a nation it becomes an inclusive term. Here is an arithmetical statement: Love—choice (or preference)==democracy. Our country is already on that ideal basis on which each is deeply concerned for the interests of all. But we are a careless people and have allowed many inconsistent elements to creep into our national life; these we must remedy. I have no desire to offer a political program, nor to state a political creed; but there can be no doubt that among the ends to be attained are these: the freeing of natural opportunity from the grip of the monopolist, the abolition of destructive poverty, the ending of all lines of business which can exist only by deterioration of men and women, and of all those which pander to human vices. Even so stated we have a sufficient task, but I doubt not it will prove an increasing one.

This function, which has no institution definitely founded to perform it, I propose to an institution which has come to lack any very vital function and is in danger of hopeless atrophy. I mean the Christian church. Few realize to how great an extent the church has yielded

its former duties to other agencies. It was once the only source of education, it was the dispenser of charity, it had charge of the sick and suffering, it was the guardian of public and private morals, it was almost the sole publisher of books, it developed music and the arts, it supplied and presented the drama. All of these functions have in some measure, many of them wholly, passed to secular institutions either public or private: city, state, nation, or private corporations have replaced the church as the agencies by which man serves himself in these vital capacities. Even the task of saving man from hell after death has ceased to be regarded very seriously. For the rest, the church is an important social centre for its members, and a more or less active helper in social activities according to its leadership. Its place and its purpose is ill-defined, and there can be no question that it is progressively losing its grip on society.

Here is a great duty awaiting the church. It is in accord with the best tradition of those on whose guidance the church depends. It re-establishes the purpose proclaimed by the prophets, re-enforced by the Great Teacher, and vaguely promised by church leaders in every age, if not in this world, then in a world to come. Offering a task worthy of the best genius of mankind, it would enable the church to attract the first-rate minds and hearts which now must seek other fields of labor, where their powers will be more effective. It has the plant, the organization, the tradition, the hopes, which would easily fit it to be the great adult school of ideal democracy. It could provide place and leadership for earnest and impartial study of the pressing problems which confront the twentieth century, and this without partizanship or prejudice, but in the pure spirit of the seeker for right and truth.

Only our narrow conservatism, our selfishness, our timidity, block our way to the land of heart's-desire. If it were untunnelled mountains, trackless deserts, or uncharted seas, how quickly we would conquer them. Cannot the church lead us in this greater conquest of our own spirits? Cannot we all unite freely in striving definitely for that social order on earth which we have dimly pictured in heaven?

THE FEDERATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALS.

CHARLES W. WENDTE, D.D.

My contribution to the symposium of thought and sentiment which we present this evening to the members and friends of this association is indicated in its very title —The Federation of Religious Liberals.

First of all, what do we mean when we speak of a religious liberal? Perhaps no word has been more shockingly abused than the term "liberal," so that it is small wonder there exists in the religious world such a prejudice against it. This prejudice can only be overcome by giving a right definition to the word and then living up to our larger, nobler, more religious conception of it.

In the interest of this juster interpretation of liberalism I ask, What is it to be a liberal in religion?

Certainly a man is not liberal simply because he holds advanced or radical opinions. Whether he is liberal or not will depend on the spirit in which he holds them. If that spirit is narrow, unsympathetic with others' thought; scornful, intolerant, and irreverent —such a man is not a liberal. He is a bigot, no matter how freely he has discarded the traditional creeds or how vehemently he denounces the authority of pope, council, church, or clergy.

On the other hand, a man who still clings to these, who accepts the old dogmas and cherishes the traditional forms of piety, if he displays a broad and kindly temper toward those who differ from him in opinion, if he is ready to believe in others' sincerity and is charitable toward their views, if, in a word, he is "reverent toward others' reverences" that man is a liberal, no matter how orthodox his creed may be. For it is not the holding of this or that set of opinions, however advanced, but the spirit in which they are held, which marks the true liberal. It is a great misfortune for the cause of freedom and religious progress that this is not more generally recognized by the advocates of a rational faith. The mistaken notion widely prevails among them that a man is liberal simply because he is opposed to orthodox forms of belief. The man who vehemently denounces the inherited traditional creeds and institutions of Christendom, and ridicules and heaps scorn upon

those that uphold them, usually justifies his course on the ground that he is liberal.

And yet, if my contention be true, he is simply a narrow, prejudiced, intolerant fanatic, only—a fanatic for free instead of conventional religion. Both types are equally unlovely and harmful to the cause of true religion. But the radical bigot is more hateful than the orthodox, because the logic of his principles ought to teach him to the contrary, and lead him to employ more sympathetic and gentle methods in religion. The worst displays of illiberality are often to be found in the free-thinkers' conventions and in their newspapers, while, on the other hand, not a few professedly orthodox pulpits and journals are weekly illustrations that men may profess the traditional views and yet display the most broad and reconciling temper.

To be liberal, therefore, is not to hold this or that set of opinions. It is not to antagonize other people's opinions. It is not, finally, to have no opinion at all. Liberalism is a temper, an attitude of the mind,—a disposition of the heart toward truth. Liberalism is the supremacy of the spirit over the letter in religion. It is the mind in a state of growth, and is thus distinguished from orthodoxy, which is the type of a mind that has stopped growing, which accepts finalities in religion, and claims that its opinions are infallible.

Liberalism affirms that thought is free, and that to attempt to cram it into dogmatic formulas, and thus arrest its growth, is a crime against nature and an impiety against God. The true liberal recognizes that there should be progress in religion as in all else. He keeps his mind open to every influence that will increase his knowledge, enlarge his mind, and improve his character. He seeks to grow as the plant grows, as the tree adds layer to layer, as the whole creation develops the ever-increasing purpose of its Maker. In a word, the liberal thinker is an evolutionist. He believes with the poet,—

"Through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."

Liberalism believes in sincerity in matters of faith. It fearlessly utters its honest convictions. It abhors cowardice, it deprecates mental reserve, it despises hypocrisy. It speaks the truth fearlessly, but it speaks it in love. For love is the universal solvent which melts even the rigidity of dogma and tradition. No mind can be

truly free which entertains a hateful, scornful spirit against another mind. The true liberal not only tolerates, he loves his fellow-men. He is charitable to their intellectual errors and sympathetic with their endeavors after truth. He reverences their reverences. He knows how gradual is the change from one set of opinions to another. Therefore, he is not impatient with error, if it be error held in the spirit of truth. The only unpardonable sin in his eyes is uncharity,—a loveless heart, an intolerant mind.

This is our answer to the question, What is it to be a liberal in religion?

Now, liberals of this type are to be found in all the religions of the earth, both Christian and non-Christian, among Jews and among Gentiles. We have only to recall the beautiful representation of such a liberal in the Jew Nathan, in Lessing's great drama "Nathan the Wise."

It is quite natural that where they are numerous and strong enough such liberal thinkers should come together for exchange of sentiment and service, and for united action in the furtherance of their principles and aims in the community. In this way the several so-called liberal denominations have arisen. Such are the Liberal or Progressive Friends, also called Quakers, in whom this union of intellectual freedom, spirituality, and a sweet and reconciling temper seems to have reached its highest development in Christendom. Such again are the Reform Jews, in one of whose splendid temples we are privileged to hold to-night the opening session of our congress; the Universalist denomination, with nearly eight hundred congregations of earnest, democratic, humanitarian worshippers; the Unitarian fellowship, strong not in the number but in the quality of its membership and in devotion to high ideals of personal liberty, culture, and character; the Liberal German Protestant churches, helping to keep alive in this New World the intellectual courage, scholarship, and piety of a Martin Luther, Lessing, Schleiermacher and Pfleiderer; the Ethical Culture Societies, holding up to us the supreme requirements of the moral law.

These liberal sects and associations differ from each other in their religious antecedents, doctrines, and methods of worship, but they have this one trait in common—they all alike hold that religion is greater than dogma, that personal character is of more importance than speculative opinions, that human love and service and the

natural piety of the heart are more acceptable to God than mere orthodoxy of belief or a correct and punctilious performance of rites and ceremonies.

In a word, they all accept the noble definition of religion given by the Old Testament prophet, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before thy God?"—which is to say that moral uprightness, loving service, and reverence are the essence and the essentials of religion.

In the same spirit the great Jew whom Christendom accepts as its sacred teacher and leader declares that to keep the two great commands of the Law, "to love the Lord with all one's mind and heart and soul and strength, and one's neighbor as one's self,"—is to be accepted of God and to save one's soul alive. And Jesus illustrated this teaching by his immortal parables the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan, the one teaching the eternal Fatherhood of God, the other the duties and privileges of universal human brotherhood.

Now it was inevitable that when these liberal associations and churches discovered how much they had in common, and that they were animated by the same reconciling, irenic spirit, they should come together and form a larger union for mutual sympathy and united endeavors. In this way there came into being the National Federation of Religious Liberals.

In 1908, in the old Quaker meeting house on North 15th Street in Philadelphia, there assembled a little company of truth-seekers and worshippers, lovers of liberty and of men, who formed the association whose Seventh Congress we begin this evening.

But at the very outset of our enterprise we made another discovery and advance. We found that not only in the sects and bodies already mentioned, but in churches and denominations commonly called orthodox there were men and women, ministers and laity, who, while holding a more conservative interpretation of Christianity than our own, were equally animated by the spirit of freedom, of liberality and good-will in religion. In the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Congregational, and many other denominations are individual believers and groups of people who are possessed of the same largeness of mind, the same inclusive, reconciling spirit which we avowed liberals at least strive to manifest. These also desired to enter into fellowship with us, a fellowship beyond the lines of sect and creed.

You have only to look at the first page of the program of our Congress which is in your hands, and to read there the names of twenty-eight clergymen representing fifteen different denominations, who to-day welcome our Federation to Pittsburgh and participate in its meetings, to find an eloquent and impressive testimony to this larger fellowship which, from the very first meeting in Philadelphia until now, has characterized the history of our association. Upon its platform and in its Board of Government all shades of belief and denominational connection have been represented, Jews, Roman Catholics, Protestants, and religious free-thinkers. And always our conventions have been constructive, harmonious, kindly, with great differences of opinion still maintaining the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace.

For this is our purpose and aim as an association. We do not desire a closer union. We seek to federate, not to absorb each other. We all have our own private beliefs and church affiliations. We would not minimize the value of such theological distinctions and denominational attachments.

We do not aim at oneness of doctrine or uniformity of worship. But we are alike animated by the love of truth and purity, the love of God displayed in love to man, by a common hunger and thirst after righteousness and the simple piety of the heart.

These to us are the only desirable tests, the only possible terms of religious fellowship. Any attempt to bring about religious unity by means of uniformity of belief or identity of worship seems to us bound to fail. It does not allow for the individuality and variety of the human intellect, and the great diversity in the spiritual antecedents, capacities, tastes, and needs of mankind. It is forbidden by the nature of truth itself, which is not static and final; not a sacred deposit to be accepted *en bloc*, unaffected by the flight of time or altered circumstances, but is dynamic, ever in flux, an ever-changing and developing process and revelation, so that to-day's truth may be to-morrow's error.

But, as Emerson reminds us, while "intellectual sympathies are limited, moral sympathies are universal." In the latter, therefore, we shall find our true bond of union and our warrant for federated endeavors.

In the presence of the great ethical problems of human society, in confronting the urgent needs and just demands of the modern social order, how small appear the specu-

lative issues which so often divide religious people and keep them apart, when they ought to be working shoulder to shoulder to lessen the sorrows, enlarge the welfare, and increase the happiness of their fellows!

"What might be done, if men were wise,
What glorious deeds, my suffering brother,
Would they unite in love and right,
And cease their scorn of one another.

"All slavery, warfare, lies, and wrongs,
All vice and crime might die together,
And fruit and corn, to each man born,
Be free as warmth in summer weather.

"The meanest wretch that ever trod,
The deepest sunk in guilt and sorrow,
Might stand erect in self-respect,
And share the teeming world to-morrow.

"What might be done? This might be done
And more than this, my suffering brother;
More than the tongue e'er said or sung,
If men were wise and loved each other."

THE MUTUAL RELATIONS BETWEEN REFORM JUDAISM AND LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY TO-DAY.

REV. DR. WILLIAM ROSENAU.

I know no more fitting place for the holding of a congress of this kind than the Jewish temple of this community. Here history was made for Liberalism in religion. In 1885 a number of Rabbis of the Jewish Reform Movement met here and formulated what is now known as the Pittsburgh Platform. Permit me to quote two trenchant sentences from that platform: "We recognize in Judaism a progressive religion striving to be in accord with the postulates of reason. . . . Christianity and Islam being daughter religions of Judaism, we appreciate their providential mission in the spreading of their monotheistic and moral truth."

So much for the broadness and tolerance shown by Jewish leaders more than thirty years ago. No less broad and tolerant did some Christian leaders prove themselves in many ways at that time. Thirty years are, however, a long period for an attitude to be maintained, and appear long because of that which men will, by way of change of thought and change of front, crowd into thirty years, especially under existing conditions. Hence it is well to consider the mutual relations obtaining between Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity to-day.

The fact which leads to this inquiry is, that in some respects Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity have this in common—that they are outgrowths of, or departures from, the specific orthodoxy from which they respectively differ.

What Liberal Christianity is has been explained by the previous speakers. As I listened to their remarks I felt myself deeply indebted to them for having dispelled for me some of the doubts which were in my mind with regard to what is implied by the term "Liberal Christianity." Mine shall be the purpose to explain to you what "Reform Judaism" is, as the men whom we have already heard elucidated the character of Liberal Christianity. It is highly necessary to understand thoroughly Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity before we venture to point out their mutual relations. Liberal Christianity is understood no more by Jews than Reform Judaism is understood by Christians.

Let me therefore put the question, What is Reform Judaism? It is not a separate and distinct wing of the Synagogue, as is either Protestantism or Catholicism a distinct wing of the Church. Despite the division of Jewry into Orthodox, Conservative, Reform and Radical Jews, Israel is united. Israel's unity manifests itself not only in the readiness with which the Reform Jew of this country will come to the aid of the Orthodox Jew in foreign lands when the latter is a sufferer, but also in the history, the literature and the ideals they have in common and ardently cherish.

Reform Judaism is a movement which has for its purpose the adaptation of Judaism to the needs of modern life. As such, it has not been any too popular. Its experience has been replete with denunciation. And yet, Reform Judaism has not become disheartened.

But why should Reform Judaism's experience have been otherwise? The disturbance of old beliefs is always resented and misinterpreted.

Reform Judaism is a natural growth. Its birth was unavoidable. It had for its mother the spirit of Israel and for its father the self-asserting justice of the world.

Reform Judaism is not altogether an American creation, although it seems to have thrived more here in America than elsewhere. The liberty of conscience and reason, vouchsafed to all in this land, was calculated to promote Reform Judaism in the United States more than in England, where it is, unfortunately, an arrested development, or in Germany, where the political improvement of Jews engaged all the attention of German-Jewry to the exclusion of their religious unfolding.

Reform Judaism is German in its origin. The earliest Reformers were Germans. They could not help but view life differently from their fathers the very moment that the Ghetto walls were thrown ajar for Jews to come out and university doors were opened for Jews to enter. Those who know how long the Jew has been given a chance alongside of the Christian must realize that Reform Judaism is but a little older than one hundred years.

That Reform Judaism has helped to save Israel and also, through Israel, much that is vital in the life of humanity, must be conceded by Reform Judaism's severest critics. It has not only modernized and beautified the service of the synagogue, but it has also—and this needs more particularly to be noted—subjected the stupendous Jewish heritage to careful scrutiny and judgment. It has sought

to distinguish between the eternal and the temporal. In the degree in which Reform Judaism did this, it discovered the truth and separated the truth from error. The truth in turn made for God-intoxication, personal uplift, and human betterment.

In this sacred work which is chronicled to the credit of Reform Judaism, Reform Judaism shows itself to have reckoned with tradition rather than traditions, and to have emphasized universalism rather than nationalism.

From the history of the Church I take it that the method of Liberal Christianity has been very much the same as that employed by Reform Judaism.

At what conclusions did Reform Judaism arrive with regard to the mysteries which make up the riddle of the universe? Although Reform Judaism has no fixed creed and has avoided the formulation of a creed because of the fear that such formulation might lead to the stagnation of religious thinking, we are nevertheless in a position to state certain points on which all Reform Jews are agreed. They are: The unity of the Supreme Being, who is the Absolute Reason; the free-will of man, his ability to be happy, and his hope of immortality; the mission of a necessarily dispersed Israel as a priest-people among the nations of the world; the destiny of mankind to become a universal brotherhood with the growth of the recognition of the Fatherhood of God; and the help of the truths of Scriptures in the worship of God, the maintenance of man's privilege, the fulfilment of Israel's mission, and the attainment of mankind's destiny.

While Reform Judaism has its theology and ethics, it is not a system of abstractions. It wisely employs the concrete religious observance in teaching men all the more effectually the abstract truths, provided the religious observance is instinct with life and inspiration.

All that Reform Judaism recognizes is retained and preached as Maimonides has it "for the sake of the purification and ennoblement of man." I should not be at all surprised but what you will say that much which I claim for Reform Judaism may be claimed for Liberal Christianity. All the better it is if such be the case. As a matter of fact, all liberal religious work is for naught else but to bring into the world more of God, more of holiness, and more of humanity. It is not so much creed that liberal religions are after as it is the translation of creed into conduct.

Heaven knows that we need now more of God, more of holiness, and more of humanity than we encounter. It

is in consequence of the lack of these blessings that we suffer from social injustice, moral decline, religious decay, national hatreds, and the world war.

Let no one imagine that Reform was a new movement even a hundred years ago. It was new only in so far as it was an organized effort. It is a constitutional tendency in our religion's make-up. In a single phrase, "Reform inheres in Judaism." All of Judaism's history is illustrative of Reform—as an adaptation to the new thought. Did not the Jews of Babylonia endeavor to harmonize their Judaism with Babylonian teachings; the Jews of the Neo-Persian Empire theirs with Persian civilization; the Jews of the Middle Ages theirs with Aristotelianism; the Jews at the beginning of Rationalism theirs with Kantism; and the Jews of the last century theirs successively with the philosophies of Hegel, Spencer, and Bergson? Even the much-maligned Talmudic Rabbis were advocates of Reform. The Jew always listened to the truth, tested the truth, and applied the truth.

I cannot say what the mutual relations between Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity to-day are, but I can tell you what they should be. They should include first mutual co-operation, insured by Reform Judaism's and Liberal Christianity's performance of the task voluntarily assumed by each respectively. Then they should embrace mutual respect, necessarily preceded by Reform Judaism's and Liberal Christianity's manifestation of self-respect. And finally, they should comprise mutual forbearance with one another, guaranteed by Reform Judaism's and Liberal Christianity's recognition of their own shortcomings.

If these relations shall exist, there will be no class, no sacrifice of principles, no leap over natural stages in the process of thought-development. Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity will be what they ought to be—parallel lines, which if sufficiently prolonged will eventually meet. Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity shall make for the day when the world will know that the Lord requires of man nothing but "to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly, before [his] God." Then what makes the Jew in the Christian's eyes a Christian shall make the Christian in the eyes of the Jew a Jew, if I may use an oft-quoted thought from Lessing's "Nathan the Wise." Forward, then, unitedly; let the liberal faiths, Reform Judaism and Liberal Christianity, march and fill the world with the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea.

ADDRESSES
ON
RELIGIOUS RECONSTRUCTION.

THE NEED FOR A NEW VISION OF GOD.

REV. RICHARD WILSON BOYNTON.

Mr. President and Members of the Federation of Religious Liberals: It is a matter of keen regret to me at this moment that our morning conference is not to open with the noble eloquence of Rev. William L. Sullivan of New York, because he would be able, with his command of the resources of spiritual feeling, with his delicate and comprehensive grasp of the values of religious experience, to set the keynote which, because of his absence, I cannot but feel will be relatively wanting. I did not come here to give a popular address upon the great topic that has been assigned to me. Following the suggestion of the Secretary, Dr. Wendte, I have prepared a somewhat sober, philosophical essay to which I ask your close attention. There is nothing in it which is beyond the reach of any one who will patiently listen. Permit me to preface what I have to offer by a quotation, the closing sentence in a recent notable book by Professor George Albert Coe of Union Theological Seminary on "The Psychology of Religion,"—not a radical author, not a member nominally of one of the radical branches of Christendom, but of a more conservative branch:—

"The thought of God," says Professor Coe, "may, indeed, undergo yet many transformations, but in one form or another it will be continually renewed as an expression of the depth and height of social experience and social aspiration." Now the emphasis of that striking sentence is the same as in my address of this morning. The thought of God may, yes, must undergo transformation; but it will also be continually renewed and its ancient values preserved as an expression of social experience and social aspiration.

I.

What need is there for a new vision of God? That there is such need may be seen from the unquestioned fact that for a multitude of the best-trained and most earnest minds of to-day the older, inherited God-vision

of the Christian past does not any longer possess either reality or convincing power. To be fully real to the instructed intelligence of the present age, as an integral part of its life, "closer than breathing and nearer than hands and feet," God must again become for us wholly concrete—as concrete and as much a matter of common experience as, for example, our human friends or our material surroundings. Unless we can walk with Him in the garden in the cool of the day, meet Him at the door of our dwelling, commune with Him in the night-watches, and go and come with Him on our way to and from our daily work, He is a mere absentee God, fit for learned speculation as to His possible existence, but not for genuine worship, not for actual service. Such an absentee God, utterly useless in any actual situation, has become for many of us the God of our childhood instruction and early, trusting faith. Either we shall live, as many are now living, without any God at all,—a perfectly possible and endurable life, but one lacking in the highest incentive,—or we shall somehow regain the vision of a Being with whom we may be in conscious action and reaction, whose definite help we may count on in time of trouble, and in whose perfect strength and adequacy we may rest secure. In such a God not only the privileged few but also the burdened many should be able, in strict literalness, to live and move and have their being.

The first part of the serious and reverent thought-adventure to which I now invite you must consist of a reasoned demonstration, as brief as it can be made, that what has just been asserted is true; namely, that to those minds which have assimilated in any degree the results of nineteenth-century science and philosophy—to go no farther back—the inherited God-vision of the Christian ages is in manifold ways no longer satisfying. I go on to specify three of these ways, in which it seems to me to need amendment.

(1) The God-vision that we have inherited from tradition—and I may add, as much from Jewish tradition as from Christian—tends to be exclusively transcendent. Does God concern Himself with affairs in this lower world? That He does so is much asserted, but little apparent. The prevailing teaching of conservative Christianity is that this present world is about as bad and hopeless as it well can be, but that desire for betterment can only be realized in a world beyond this one. That is, the issues

joined on earth are miraculously transferred to heaven, and here, where we still confront our harrowing problems and our bitter griefs, no relief is provided. That simply will not do! We want justice and right here; and furthermore we are determined they shall ultimately be here, with the help of a God who can accomplish something. The older God-vision, then, in the first place, is too remote, too abstract, too transcendent. It no longer inspires us with a sense of present actuality, of living companionship. Following the bent of the best of recent thinking, we must have a more immanent vision to take its place. That is our first demand—for immanence, immediacy, functioning now and here—in a vision of God that can satisfy the inextinguishable need of men and women of modern outlook.

(2) In the second place, the God-vision which we have inherited is over-individualized. King, judge, father—these are the leading impersonations. It need not be denied that all three figures have some—perhaps enduring—symbolic value. They are at any rate too firmly rooted in long usage to be quickly set aside. Yet their anthropomorphism is excessive and has patent and serious effects on current belief. In the new Weltanschauung,—to use an untranslatable German word,—in the new world-view which recent science and philosophy have constructed for us, this strictly individualized deity has become no longer thinkable. The conception is childishly crude, barren of contact with reality as we now understand it, and, worst of all, out of touch with present modes of feeling. We cannot think such a God; we cannot feel Him. Even the concept of Father, taken in its transcendent sense,—"Our Father who art in heaven,"—leaves us cold. Examine your own heart and see if what I say is not actually so. If not, what I have to add is not for you. The symbolic value—and it is entirely symbolic—of Fatherhood is not denied, and its association with Jesus makes it precious to us; but I ask you what is the thought-value of this symbolism? The answer is, first, that it signifies that the universe is not evil or hostile to us, but is at least neutral and receptive to our endeavors; second, that Fatherhood represents the unity of all mankind as one family. The tender, comforting, sustaining thoughts that attach to the conception of Fatherhood can as easily attach to another. The mystical part can, if necessary, be transferred to a more adequate image.

The difficulty I am constrained to press is not only

moral, but also metaphysical. The unity which we conceive to be the basic principle of the universe is not individual, unless in a very extended sense. Universe is a noun of multitude. It names a unity in variety, a harmony of opposites. Of this recurring problem of the one in the many, the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity was, for its time and in its Greek philosophical environment, a respectable and even admirable attempt at a solution. Not for nothing have many gifted minds in our time turned for relief to one or another form of pluralism. The heart cannot feed its springs, or the mind sustain its inevitable conclusions, on a barren and abstract monotheism. The unity of the world has become something incomparably more wealthy than such a conception suggests. We must have elements in our God-vision that come into closer touch with humanity. In saying that the current conception is over-individualized, I have not for a moment forgotten the vital idea of personality. But why take personality in a narrowly individual sense? There is permanent truth in the suggestion of Herbert Spencer that our choice is not between personality and something lower than personality, but between personality and something that may be higher. The word "personality" is, of course, almost fatally ambiguous. Is it not high time that we broke the bounds of mere isolated individuality and expanded the meaning of personality into some super-individual richness of content? I shall come back to this later.

One may discover indications, even in unexpected quarters, pointing significantly toward this conclusion. Thus, the recent Unitarian assertion of the Unity of God has decidedly not made way against the older doctrine of the Trinity—the richer, more socialized conception holding its own against the essential poverty of an oversimplified unification. When you simplify anything to the extent of squeezing the life out of it, you kill it. To this the eloquent and philosophically competent writings of Dr. George A. Gordon, among others, bear convincing witness. Also, the more thoughtful writers among Unitarians admit the inadequacy of a too narrow reading of the mystery of personality. Dr. James Drummond, in his "Studies in Christian Doctrine," declares that, while God is to be considered as "personal," He is not to be described as "a person." The bearing of so great a concession from that cautious writer is not to be minimized. Professor Eucken feels the difficulty to such an extent

that he proposes a substitution of the term "Godhead" for the term "God," although later he asserts that for the religious life itself all the values of personality must be scrupulously kept. Do not be misled as to the trend of what I am saying. It is not my thought—in truth, it is the farthest possible from my thought—that a retrogression to the Athanasian Trinity is to be desired. The Greek metaphysical Trinity, to adapt a saying of one of its critical historians, is "as dead as Pan." The progress I have in mind is, nevertheless, away from an individual and toward a social vision of God. Personality, in some more inclusive sense, may be kept, while variety in unity is not sacrificed.

(3) Meanwhile, there is a third respect in which our inherited vision of God fails crucially to meet existing needs. In accounting for this I shall have to plunge boldly into waters of greater depth than we have yet encountered. But the attempt to ford them is necessary, if our adventure is to be pursued successfully to the end.

This audience hardly needs to be reminded that Kant established the truth that the two basic forms of our sensuous apprehension of objects—of all objects of perception whatsoever—are space and time. This fundamental axiom of the critical philosophy is known to us in a way. But until our minds have acquired a certain alertness on the point we scarcely realize how completely our ordinary speech, and consequently our superficial thinking, is saturated and dominated by space and time imagery, and how important it is for any serious undertaking in thought to acquire a full consciousness of this.

The universe, considered in its space-relations, appears to us a scene, like this church-interior where we are; considered in its time-relations it is a process, like the process of our coming here. The one is essentially static—it stands still—while the other is essentially dynamic—forever moving; and between the two, though in outward reality we find them marvellously intertwined, yet in thought a great gulf appears fixed. We seem to be unable to think them both together, and so are reduced, as a rule unconsciously to ourselves, to making a choice between them. This mankind generally does spontaneously and without realizing it. Even philosophers do the same, and show no sign of knowing what they do. If the spatial aspect is preferred, instinctively the time-process is relegated to a secondary place or is suppressed. If the temporal aspect is put first, the universe as an extended

scene of physical activity retreats into a minor place. Some mixture of the two can hardly be avoided, but one or the other is certain to be foremost.

I find here the real nub of William James's vigorous assault on what he called the "block-universe," in favor of the looser form in which he felt at home, as more congruous with experienced reality. It is not apparent that he was himself aware of just where the cleavage came. But it is perfectly plain that in any conception of the universe as spatially determined, the sense of concrete process is automatically excluded. It would take a long time to argue this elaborately; I must content myself here with stating it, and go on; but those of you who have read Bergson know I am dwelling on what he calls "real duration." Now that the former type of universe, with its corresponding God-vision, namely, God visualized in terms of space, has hitherto prevailed in Christian tradition can be shown by calling a long list of witnesses, from the author of Revelation, with his vision of the heavenly throne and the four and twenty elders around the sea of glass, down to the earlier writings of Josiah Royce. One of the remarkable conversions of recent philosophy was when Royce began to see the light of a new day, and to swing over with his mighty bulk of mind and rich freight of learning from the obsolescent to the emerging vision of God.

The classical example of the block-universe, spatially conditioned, carried up into the supernatural and over into the hereafter, is Dante's "Divine Comedy." It is the epitome of mediæval Catholic dogma, transported bodily into early Protestant dogma. Life in that wonder-world of the poet's imagination is predominantly spatial and static. His Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise form one grandiose scene, appropriately shown not long ago on a moving-picture film. Dante and his companions are almost all that can be said to move in the picture. The total effect is one of immobile and placid rigidity. In the Inferno some of the condemned move slightly, in their anguish, and one sad company circles endlessly through the dark abyss. In the Purgatorio a few climb painfully the steep mount of penitence. In the Paradiso the glorified, in the highest heaven of the Mystic Rose,—rank encircling rank about the central throne,—move their lips in endless song. But that is all. Space-imagery reigns supreme. And if we analyze the systems of Christian doctrine down to the present, it becomes

apparent that time-imagery, in the sense of an actual process, is practically absent. Yet recall the significance of Jesus' thought in its original idiom. Nothing is said of this lower world and the world of heaven above. What Jesus talks about is this age and the age to come. His thinking is in time rather than in space relations. That emphasis has been simply forgotten. Milton, the poet of English Protestantism, may voice the truer insight in lines like these:—

> "The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven."

Nevertheless, the Christian consciousness in general continues to envisage heaven and hell as localities where we are to spend eternity, not as states of spirit in ourselves. This habit of thinking in space-relations is so inveterate as to seem almost second-nature. Bergson has done more than any other recent thinker to shake our minds out of it, but his influence is not widespread as yet, though it is slowly pervasive.

In point of fact, for the trained intelligence of to-day, with the enormous revolution in knowledge, space-relations, which dominated the mediæval mind, have fallen back into a decidedly secondary rank, and time-relations have come very prominently to the fore. Especially is this apparent in the sphere of our religious conceptions. Since Copernicus, the cosmic spaces are full, indeed, of physical and mathematical interest; but for moral and spiritual impetus we no longer look to heaven, but to history and prophecy. Since Hegel, the historical has been the leading category in all the sciences pertaining to man. It would be trite to name here the exponents of cosmical and biological evolution who dominate the sciences of nature. The learned world may not yet be prepared to commit itself unreservedly to any one form of the development theory—Lamarckian, Darwinian, Mendelian or Bergsonian—but some form of creative evolutionism appears as certain to rule for many ages ahead of us as did once the philosophy of Aristotle, from the time of Augustine to that of Galileo. The unavoidable corollary, as I contend, is that we must begin to envisage the divine life in the world in terms of a real process, and not in terms of an immobile, eternal scene. Our evolutionism may as well be radical and unsparing. If reality does not grow, but is the same yesterday, to-day,

and forever, then a static God will serve us. We can adopt the pious motto,—

> "In heavenly love abiding,
> No change my heart shall fear;
> And safe is such confiding,
> For nothing changes here."

That was the characteristically mediæval attitude. Most congregations sing that hymn yet with profound inner satisfaction. This is one explanation why the churches, as typically static forces, are as a rule so weak in social and public influence. They stand mostly for a day in human thought whose sun set below the horizon when Darwin destroyed the cosmogony of Genesis, and when from believing in the fall of man, the progressive part of humanity began to believe in man's gradual rise from lowly beginnings. If a radical evolutionism is true, then God is alive and growing with His continuous creation. From Emerson, the prophet of transcendentalism, we get these contrasting lines:—

> "Ever fresh the broad creation,
> A divine improvisation,
> From the heart of God proceeds—
> A single will, a million deeds."

This is the insight that is fast growing in the younger and more alert minds. The flowing categories of the time-process begin to be admitted everywhere. Freedom, as Bergson has shown us, once more becomes a reality and not a sham. What we do or do not do, individually, counts in the grand total. Unless God can be found within the process, there working His will and there securing His ends, then no vision of God can be had which will possess concrete actuality for that great future into which the currents of this tremendous time are so swiftly hurrying us.

II.

If I may venture to assume that I have shown, by this destructive criticism, that there is urgent need in our time for a new vision of God, to replace the exclusively transcendent, over-individualized, and essentially spatial or static vision which is our inheritance from a noble past,—the positive part of my task, yet to be undertaken, should now consist in indicating the leading traits of the new God-vision that is congenial to the mind of our time and seems destined to guide its ethical and religious en-

deavor. These traits emerge by simple antithesis from the previous discussion. The new concrete vision of God will be, as I see it, prevailingly immanent, social, and dynamic in character. I must undertake to justify this contention as briefly as possible. These three leading traits inhere so closely in each other that they do not require to be discussed apart, but can best be considered together.

It is a curious but not unnatural fact, that the analogy of human government has played a leading though not explicit part in the determination of even the most highly developed God-conceptions. Obviously the transcendent, individual, static God-vision that we have found ourselves compelled to reject is in fact the vision of a universal monarch or patriarch, ruling by the divine right of a fixed and absolute status his submissive kingdom or clan. Governmentally, the universe of Christian tradition is a monarchy, with Jesus as an accredited ambassador sent by the transcendent deity on an important mission to his earthly subjects. Can there be any doubt about this? Conversely, then, the immanent, social, dynamic God-vision for which I speak is the image of a democracy of finite, limited, but not necessarily mortal, spirits, whose uniting bond or abiding life is God—not away off up there on a throne, but in ourselves, present, immanent, functioning in these lives of ours as through all the past, and through all the future of humanity. That over-individual life of God is precisely as real as the life of our country over against the lives of its individual citizens. When you rise in a great company to sing "The Star-Spangled Banner" or "My Country, 'Tis of Thee," is the passion of patriotism that thrills you real or not? Shall not our vision of God be to us as thrilling and intense as our love of country? Not, then, hereafter, the "kingdom" of God but the "democracy" of God is to be our rallying cry.

The thought is perhaps a little startling in its first sharp definition. It may become more acceptable if we realize that it is only the modern way of stating the long-neglected Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. We are merely restating the old Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit in modern language. As Professor Royce puts it in one of his last published writings, God for us is "the spirit of the beloved community." God is right here, living with us and in us, and we are in the most literal sense His fellow-workers. In that word "community," of which

Royce's latest philosophy makes so much and so fruitful use, we have the kind of pregnant conception after which we have been groping. Human life is the continuous and advancing enterprise of the ever-dying and ever-renewed community of dwellers on this earth. You and I have recently come into it and we are soon going out of it. The enterprise and the community will go on, now with us, then without us. In the great human community, no one is the privileged recipient of a special revelation, though some may have a finer and deeper spiritual insight than others. If influences reach us from the beyond, they come at least in a form that is accessible to us all. Mostly they come by inheritance or by discovery. More and more, to adopt a happy phrase of Professor Boutroux, we are coming to think in terms of "the beyond that is within." The time-form is the mould, said Kant, of all our inner life. This does not mean that it is merely subjective. The social implications of a common speech and of common thought-categories forbid that. The universe itself comes to consciousness within us, and comes to consciousness as an immanent, social process, whose meanings and whose promise are within itself and not elsewhere. This is the summing up of the critical and idealistic philosophy, as I understand it. On these lines, if on any, the new vision of God must gradually take shape, for the healing of the nations.

I hope that my presentation of this thought has not seemed harsh and negative and over-bold. That it may appear so to those to whom it is new I do not question. It is inevitable that a new thought should first visit us in its nakedness, before we can clothe it with the higher spiritual values of imagination and mystical contemplation and traditional reverence. Only those can truly bid it welcome to whom it comes as an actual solution for painful doubts. That it is such a solution for much of the corroding scepticism of the best spirits in our time, one is firmly convinced from the many directions in which we see it insensibly taking root.

I do not mean to imply by what has been said that I think the imagery of an immanent, social, dynamic Godhead is exhaustive of the divine being in its complete reality. In my view, all such symbolism is relative. On Kantian principles, the ultimate reality, or noumenon, or thing-in-itself, or God—whichever we choose to call it—can never be brought within the shimmering net-

work of our categories of sense and understanding. If God is not, as Nietzsche taught, "beyond good and evil," he is assuredly beyond space and time, beyond in the sense that they are within His life rather than His life within them. It is our human vision of God of which I have consistently spoken, and my thought is, if I may venture one final repetition of it, that just as the transcendent, monarchical, static conception has had a long career in ages with whose fundamental thinking it was congruous, so in the age that is before us the immanent, social, dynamic conception is that around which thought and feeling and loyal endeavor will increasingly gather, until the values of worship and communion, now for us associated with the older image, will inhere in the newer. That the transition must be slow, for the world at large, but none the less inevitable, goes without saying, since no fabric is tougher or more resistant of change than the fabric of religion. Whether or not I have won your assent to my main position, do not misunderstand me by supposing that in my thought the new and coming God-vision will be less sustaining and comforting and inspiriting than the one we have outgrown, but as I have tried to show, because of its agreement with our essential thinking in all other fields, indefinitely more so.

Let me cite a witness to this new God-vision from a most unexpected source, the mystical Indian poetry of **Sir Rabindranath Tagore**:—

"Leave this chanting and singing and telling of beads! Whom dost thou worship in this lonely dark corner of a temple with doors all shut? Open thine eyes and see thy God is not before thee!

"He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the pathmaker is breaking stones. He is with them in sun and in shower, and his garment is covered with dust. Put off thy holy mantle and even like Him come down on the dusty soil.

"Deliverance? Where is this deliverance to be found? Our master himself has joyously taken upon him the bonds of creation; he is bound with us all forever.

"Come out of thy meditations and leave aside thy flowers and incense! What harm is there if thy clothes become tattered and stained? Meet him and stand by him in toil and in sweat of thy brow."

The new vision of God, immanent, social, dynamic, around which philosophy and poetry, moral passion, and spiritual aspiration are gathering in so notable a manner to-day, is already with us, and in the forward-reaching, active, greatly daring minds of the time is going forth **conquering and to conquer.**

THE RELIGION OF JESUS AND THE MODERN WORLD.

REV. LEE S. McCOLLESTER, D.D.

At once three questions arise:—

1. What is the religion of Jesus?
2. What is the modern world?
3. What has the religion of Jesus to do with the modern world?

I.

What was, or is, the religion of Jesus?

First of all, it was and is a matter of personal opinion. No one to-day can tell just what the religion of Jesus was in Jesus' own mind, or what it was in the mind of the first Christians. In the minds of those who to-day study the religion of Jesus there are almost as many views as there are students. Here in this large congregation no two agree on all the details of the history, doctrine, and purpose of Jesus. What each one here holds is the result of his education, the creed of his church, and his own religious temperament. From no source can one single picture which satisfies all be drawn. In the Gospels are such differences that one may draw many pictures of Jesus, and the working out of the Christian theology gives portraits strangely contradictory. Munkácsy, the artist, in his wonderfully stirring picture of Jesus before Pilate shows us the mob, wild and formless; the priests, cunning and formal; the Roman governor, dominant and exasperating to the crowd; and Jesus, solemn, defenceless, silent. But to make the picture suit my interpretation I have to redraw the person of Jesus. From my study of his life I get the figure of a man, strong among men; of a dominating personality, even when submissive; of a commanding character, even when a prisoner; of a rebuking voice, even when silent. The common effeminate pictures of the European cathedrals are inadequate to represent the Jesus that the Gospels present me. Looking on Jesus of history, my wonder is not that all the world has not yielded to his Sermon on the Mount, but that in nineteen hundred years so large a part of the world has come to put the name of Jesus above every name.

In the second place, the religion of Jesus has been of an evolutionary character. Jesus' own thoughts and his emphasis changed markedly in the three years of his active ministry. The disciples afterwards gave such general reports of him that the world's interpretations of him have passed through radical changes. We, though farthest from him in time, know him better than any earlier age, and in the making of our faith we have used all the other factors of world progress. We relate science with religion. When science is crude, religion is coarse. When religion is scientific, science becomes reverent. We see Jesus, a religious genius, ahead of his age. He perceived the truth while it was yet afar off, and since his day, as a part in the evolution of civilization, the religion of Jesus has been modifying all other factors and in turn has been enriched by all other progress.

In the third place, the religion of Jesus has spoken with authority. Man needs authority as a guarantee and as an inspiration. A soldier believing in the authority of his captain and in the justice of his cause fights well. So has it been with the army of the Christian religion. But the seat of authority in the religion of Jesus has varied from age to age. Personal friendship and appreciation of Jesus' personality were authority for the disciples and through this the early church grew. But Rome, which from her seven hills seized all good things, seized the contribution of the first Christians and made a church the authority of religion. Much of real Christianity was thereby concealed, but Rome carried the name of Christianity wherever she went. This kind of authority in time became so arbitrary that men like Luther questioned its authority and they found the Bible more authoritative than the church. This opened a new vision of salvation and stimulated free thinking. But this did not save all the world, and men then sought the authority that had given authority to the Bible, and they thought they had found it in Jesus. The many then said, "The world will soon be saved!" But this did not happen. The new use of the name of Jesus divided Protestants into hostile camps, and men fought over peculiar descriptions of him. But fighting thus, they had to think of the humanity of Jesus and of the human problems of the world. Seeking at last the authority that had made Jesus the authority, they said it was in man's soul. Salvation through the power of the Church, salvation through obedience to the Bible, salvation through faith in a par-

ticular conception of Jesus, have given way to an effort on the part of men to walk with God and with men as Jesus walked with God and with men. Obeying Jesus does not demand the doing in New England what Jesus did in Jerusalem, but what Jesus, the sane man who had faith in God and love for humanity, would do were his ministry in the New England conditions of to-day.

The religion of Jesus that proceeds from these observations does not take the form of a creed that looks to its authority in a church, a Bible, a Trinitarian or Unitarian Christ, but in a life like his,—one that walks the world, ruled by faith in God and love for men, and finds its sanction in the soul. Jesus stands an inspiring pattern, and the religion of Jesus resolves itself, not into a definite creed, but into

- a personal recognition by man's soul of an overruling power—God;
- a recognition of the God quality in the souls of all men;
- a recognition of a universally operative moral and spiritual law;
- a recognition of the solidarity and interdependence of the human race;
- a recognition of the basic law of love; and
- a recognition of the fact that soul draws from Over soul, and that if it is to advance it must obey the fundamental and eternal laws of soul growth.

II.

The second question is, What is the modern world?

It is, first of all, a very small world. There are no more continents for man to discover. By electricity, steam, and gas we are annihilating time and distance and becoming friends with the ends of the earth.

It is an interdependent world. Once a farmer on the lonely hill was able to feed and clothe his family by his own labor. To-day the millions of people that make neighborly a great city fear a railroad strike lest thereby the millions starve. War in Europe affects business and religious conditions in America. We cannot plan a single day without considering what all the rest of the world is doing.

It is a technically masterful world. Wealth is ours: Crœsus was poor compared with hundreds to-day. Invention is ours: we have conquered the forces of nature

and are masters of the earth, the sea, and the sky. Culture is ours: schools, teachers, the story of olden Greece and China, and new education makes us friends with the stars, the deep sea, and the hearts of men. A new patriotism is ours: the old idea that to the strong belong the spoils, that a single nation can live for itself, is contending with the new idea that the strong are the keepers of the weak and that the strongest nation is but a leading state in the world nation. Patrick Henry said in the first Continental Congress, "I am no longer a Virginian, but an American." The new patriot in the coming world congress of all nations is going to say, "I am no longer just an American, I am hereafter a world-citizen."

Surely this year, 1917, is a glorious one in which to be alive. It is full of new situations; the strange and the tragic are happening every hour. Men and motives are subjected to acid tests; nations warlike and neutral are trying out the question, Which is mightiest in the seats of the mighty, a Kaiser or a God? Creative genius lays its prodigal gifts at the feet of him who would destroy life by guns, and of him who would save life by hospitals. The triumphing shout of the successful gunner and the comforting song of the Red Cross nurse mingle on the same shot-plowed field. Never was there a time when human beings were at once so much the fiends of hell and the angels of heaven; never was there a time when mankind seemed so completely to have lost its Christ and to have found its Saviour, and never was there a time when there was so much need that Jesus of Nazareth should come to the troubled nations and say, "Peace, be still, and know that God still lives."

III.

Here, on the one hand, is the religion of Jesus, a religion emphasizing reverence for God and love for men; and here, on the other hand, is the world of to-day, swayed by great conflicting passions, those calling for peace and comfort and fellowship, and those calling for war and misery and hatred. Now, what of it? If the religion of Jesus is kept from the world, the world will go down as Rome did, and some day men will see splendid ruins where once were Boston, New York, Pittsburgh, and Chicago. If religion holds itself away from its responsibility because the forces of the world are warlike

and selfish, religion itself will shrivel up. The only way to save both the religion of Jesus and the modern world is to bring them together and mix them so completely that religion shall no longer say, "This is mine," and the world say, "This is mine," but both say "All are ours, and ours are God's."

Some looking on the world to-day say that religion has practically failed, that it ought to have kept the world from war. My answer is that it ought to and that it would have done this if it had been given half a chance. If those who are fighting to-day had given half the heed to what Jesus said on the Mount of Beatitudes that they have to counsels in the courts of kings, if the kings of Europe had sat at the feet of Jesus for a few days before they went to war and had been converted in their souls from avarice of power and money to service of good and humanity, there would have been no war.

Religion has not failed. The fact is, it has this time more than half succeeded. It has more nearly controlled the world at this crisis than ever before in the history of mankind. What the world is getting is what it ought to get and what it ought to expect to get. Nothing has gone wrong about the running of this universe. The reason why there is so much alarm is that the universe has gone on quite too lawfully for the plans of men; some thought they could sow cannon and reap Christmas trees, bury young men in trenches and stir mothers to songs of joy. It cannot be done! Human nature is not perfect, but it has come a long way from the brute, and it resents some things which once it endured. This age is learning in the hardest way given to men the penalties that follow a breaking of the inexorable laws of God and of following the lower of two paths offered to their feet.

I have emphasized the penalties of war, but let us not comfort ourselves with the thought that war is the world's only sin to-day, or that the consequences of the war are to be borne only by warring nations. Modern civilization has other dangers. Neutral nations even may be in danger of greater disasters than invasions of foreign nations. We worship prosperity. The hands of a technical civilization have seized America. In this we are sinning tremendously. While we talk much about patriotism, our motives of sublime patriotism are sadly mixed with avaricious love of material prosperity. This present state of modern civilization, at home and abroad, but emphasizes the duty and opportunity of religion, and it

may be—let us pray that it may be—that the day of religion's greatest adventure is drawing near. A long review of history shows that great crises in world life have led men to a new valuation of religion and to new adventures of faith. While it is true the worst war of the ages is going on, it is true also that men are calling for peace and democracy as never before; while it is true wealth is piling up with a few as never before, it is also true that more men and corporations are studying more plans for human betterment than ever before; while it is true there is a seeming indifference to the church, it is also true that churches are getting co-operative and are trying to serve each other as never before. In fine, I believe the world has already started on the new adventure of faith, and that now is the time for all of us to call men to a new and higher practice of the religion of Jesus; where there is a choice to be made we are to call men to serve the highest.

In the civilization of to-day three great forces are striving for supremacy, three great kings are calling for the favor of mankind. You may name them Cæsar, Crœsus, Christ; war, wealth, righteousness. You cannot serve with full heart all three. Jesus said, "No man can serve" even two, "God and Mammon." In this world's crisis of war, wealth, and righteousness we are asked to make our choice. This choice is to be determined not by our desires of ease and pleasure, but by our carefully wrought convictions of what is best for mankind and what fulfils the visions of man in his divinest moments. Cæsar offers us victories builded on the bodies of slaughtered men. Crœsus offers us victories built on competition, greed, and poverty; Christ offers us victories built of passions controlled, selfishness subdued, and soul emancipated. Choose this day whom ye will serve!

THE REBIRTH OF THE IMMORTAL HOPE.

ALFRED W. MARTIN, A.M., S.T.B.

It gives me exceptional pleasure to address the National Federation of Religious Liberals, because I look upon it as marking the latest forward step in religious progress. When Lessing published his "Nathan der Weise," it signalized the forward step from forbearance to tolerance, i.e., from *unwilling* to *willing* consent to let other people hold opinions different from one's own. And when this Federation was organized it signalized the further forward step from tolerance to appreciation,—the noblest word in the vocabulary of the human soul. True, there are those who look on tolerance as marking the *ne plus ultra* of religious attainment; but, after all, tolerance has always a certain atmosphere of condescension about it. We tolerate what we can't help but would put out of the way if we could. The man who tolerates always assumes an air of offensive superiority which is justly resented. Not tolerance but appreciation is the loveliest flower on the rosebush of liberalism. It is the spirit that looks upon the one hundred and thirty-seven divisions into which the Christian religion has been split and sees them all as if they were the stops and pedals of a great organ; some accentuating the essential, others the ornamental notes; no one of itself producing the full-orbed music, but the separate melodies of each blending to create the great symphony of human aspiration and faith. It is, then, a very genuine pleasure to me to address an organization so representative of this larger catholicism and fraternalism.

The subject assigned me is "The Rebirth of the Immortal Hope." Permit me, before proceeding, to register my abhorrence of dogmatism in dealing with this question of immortality. Dogmatism may be defined as affirmation without valid evidence, assertion without reasons. A dogma is a proposition pronounced true on the basis of some authority too sacred to be interrogated—an undebatable proposition. The dogmatist is one who says that no question can be opened which the Bible has closed—as though any question could ever be closed as long as any one is competent to reopen it. The dogmatist is one who holds that certain beliefs are too sacred to be questioned—as though the very sanctity of a belief did not depend, in part at least, upon its verification.

Nor, again, am I a whit less strongly opposed to sentimentalism than to dogmatism. I, for one, am utterly unwilling to satisfy my heart at the expense of my head, to sacrifice reason for the sake of faith, albeit that I recognize the place where knowledge fails and faith holds sway. If the temple of the immortal hope be not spacious enough to hold both my head and my heart, I will stay outside and wait for more satisfying evidence of what I devoutly hope is true. Dear as is the word "immortality" to me, there is one word dearer still—"truth." Deep as is my desire for personal survival of death, my desire not to be deceived, not to be fooled, is deeper still. Surely the deepest passion of the soul must be to know the truth, whatever it may be, and then calmly, loyally, adjust one's self to it. The prayer of Ajax was for light; there can be no nobler prayer.

The first point to which our attention must be directed is that faith in immortality has been reborn over and over again as one foundation after another was undermined. Consider, for example, that very popular foundation for the faith—the alleged *universality* of the belief in a life beyond death. Man, it is true, has always looked upon death as a way-station rather than as a terminus. Yet his conception of the hereafter has not always been tantamount to personal immortality, *i.e.*, conscious, active, joyous existence. Consequently we cannot support the faith in such a future on the basis of its universality. The truth is that this conception of the hereafter is not and never was *universal*. Read the Old Testament with reference to this subject and see how persistently the Hebrews held to the belief in Sheol, that "land of thick darkness, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Thither the souls of all the dead, good and bad alike, departed and there, in a colorless, shadowy, ghostlike, purposeless existence, they passed their days, a state that could not be characterized as "life," so void was it of all that the heart of man desires.

Akin to the Hebrew "Sheol" was the Greek "Hades," anticipation of which caused the Greeks to look on old age as only one degree less loathsome than death, while the Trojan Achilles expressed his preference for perpetual life on earth as a keeper of swine, to kingship over the realms of the dead, where the "shades" eke out a joyless, actionless, colorless existence. Among Greek philosophers prior to Plato the belief in personal survival after death was not deemed of sufficient consequence to be incorporated in their teaching. Socrates was even somewhat sceptical on

the subject, treating it at times with refined irony, but never once as an essential prerequisite for the moral life. Spinoza shared the ethical attitude of Socrates to the question and denied personal immortality while holding to the eternality of the human mind as "part of the infinite Substance," God.

So Lotze, among modern philosophical thinkers, saw no reason for maintaining that human beings are necessarily immortal. Rather was it his view that they fulfil a certain temporary purpose in the Divine plan, and, when fulfilled, they are no longer required in the scheme of things and so cease to be.

Confucianism, with its eighty million adherents, furnishes a present-day instance of the non-universality of the belief in immortality. The founder of that religious system was a pronounced and confirmed agnostic on the subject and inculcated absolute indifference to it. When besought by his disciples, as he so often was, to tell them something concerning the hereafter, he invariably turned their attention to the pressing moral needs for the living present. Small wonder that, for want of this belief in their own system, many Confucianists enlist the services of Taoist or Buddhist priests in the hour of death and bereavement.

But even if the belief in a hereafter were universal, it would not prove the belief to be true. The Ptolemaic astronomy was universal for centuries, but it was not true, for in 1543 Copernicus published his "Constitution of the Universe," shattering the "crystals spheres" of Ptolemy and establishing the heliocentric as a substitute for the geocentric theory of the cosmos.

To rest the faith in a future life on the foundation of *Universality* is, therefore, to base it both on an untruth and on an illogical inference.

Again, there is the *instinctive desire for immortality.* This, too, has been set forth as an adequate basis for belief in personal survival of death. It is said that because man has an instinctive desire for continuance of life after death, therefore like all his other instincts this one, too, will be provided for. Everywhere and always, we are told, the loving, yearning, hungry human heart has instinctively protested against an affirmative answer to the poet's question:—

> "Is this the whole sad story of creation
> Told by its toiling millions o'er and o'er,—
> One glimpse of day, then black annihilation,
> A sunlit passage to a sunless shore?"

Nay, not so, the heart instinctively cries, clinging with passionate embrace to its cherished faith while rebelling against such an outcome of creation's story. All our other instincts, it is fervently suggested, have their appropriate objects of satisfaction. We have an instinctive desire for food, and food is supplied; for knowledge, and the means of learning are furnished; for social relationships, and society is provided. Must not, then, this instinctive desire for personal survival after death be likewise satisfied?

But, clearly enough, the instinctive desire for food does not guarantee that for all eternity we shall be provided with all we can eat. Neither does the instinctive desire for life carry with it the certainty of its indefinite prolongation. Quite apart, however, from so unwarrantable a basis for the belief in immortality is the fact that the desire for it is by no means universally acknowledged either as an *instinctive* or as an *acquired* desire. Thousands there are within and without Christendom who confess to no consciousness of any such "*instinct*" in the psychical constitution. Other thousands have been so burdened and exasperated by the bitter, intolerable conditions of their earthly lot that for them annihilation is the ultimate desire. Still others there are, epicureans, sybarites, *bon-vivants*, people who have lived for the *lower* satisfactions of life, in whom no instinctive desire for survival of death is present, but, on the contrary, only a readiness to give place to others, now that their own "good time" has come to an end. And, if Professor Max Müller's conception of Nirvana be correct, then whole races of Buddhists anticipate ultimate annihilation as the goal of life, and welcome it as the culmination of that long series of rebirths to which they believe they are destined. And without the pale of Buddhism are thousands who, for one reason or another, have no desire for immortality, preferring annihilation to any resumption of life after death.

To base belief in a future life on an alleged *instinctive desire* for it is thus as unwarrantable as to found it on the alleged *universality* of the belief.

A third foundation, one particularly popular in the last half of the last century, is *intuition*, identified in England with the names of Coleridge, Addison, and Max Muller; identified in the United States with the names of Parker, Emerson, and the Alcotts. Their allegation was that man is in possession of a "primary faculty" which transcends reason, and as such puts one in direct touch with truth. "Immortality," said Parker, "is a primary fact of con-

sciousness," while Emerson said of it that it was "part and parcel of the human mind," requiring no more argument to prove its truth than either beauty or love. But the difficulty with intuition is that its revelations cannot be verified. If every single person acknowledged such a faculty and also acknowledged that it revealed immortality, then indeed we should have a universal criterion by which to settle the question of our faith. But the fact is that we have no such criterion.

Of the Christian foundation—I would speak of it very reverently and tenderly—one has only to say that the miracle of the resurrection of Jesus which is offered as a proof of immortality is itself in need of being proved. Every unbiassed student of the New Testament knows that when the resurrection narrative as reported in the Gospel of Mark is compared with that in the Gospel of Luke, they differ in eight particulars as to what happened at the tomb. And when the record in these two Gospels is further compared with that in the Gospel of Matthew, the points of difference increase from eight to twelve, and when the Fourth Gospel is added as a basis of comparison, the points of difference increase from twelve to twenty-one. In the last analysis, therefore, remembering we do not know who wrote any of the Gospels, all that the evidence amounts to is this: Somebody said that somebody saw Jesus somehow, somewhere, some time after he was entombed. I say this not flippantly, not iconoclastically, but simply to offer a terse summation of what the evidence warrants our believing.

Spiritualism has based its faith in a future life on the phenomena of spirit-intercourse. But the great majority of these phenomena can be accounted for without the aid of spirits. Moreover, Sir Oliver Lodge has recently told us that "there is not as yet a single bit of precise evidence in favor of the hypothesis of discarnate intelligence." In other words, we have as yet no *objective* evidence in support of the faith in immortality.

I come now to that foundation which in my judgment takes precedence over all others, the *ethical* foundation. Having been introduced as Associate Leader of the Ethical Culture Society of New York, I beg you not to misunderstand me. When I speak of the ethical attitude to the question I do not mean the attitude of the Ethical Movement toward it. It would be a serious mistake to construe the ethical foundation for faith in a future life as synonymous with that of the Ethical Movement. For,

in truth, this movement offers no foundation whatever for that faith. It dare not offer one without being false to its own distinctive and fundamental position of neutrality on all debatable questions. Representatives of the Ethical Movement are wholly free to entertain and to advocate any argument they choose for the faith in a future life. Equally free they are to accept no foundation and to make it known publicly that they are agnostics on this subject. Consequently it should be clearly understood that no one but the speaker is committed by any pronouncements on the basis for belief or disbelief in immortality. My views do not coincide with those of most of the leaders of Ethical Societies, but my right to express my honest thought is as unquestioned as theirs, provided I refrain from making the movement sponsor for my views.

Like Professor Adler, I hold that the sole substantial basis for faith in a future life is to be found in the moral nature of man, in a moral experience which every human being may have. It is that the more deeply and intensely we live the moral life, the more fully persuaded we become that there is something in us which cannot perish. And if to this experience we are privileged to add another, namely, relationship to some other soul, one who lives on a high spiritual plane, one who inspires, uplifts, exalts us, then we are forced to feel that this life cannot go to the void of nothingness, that here also, in this rare personality, is something that must survive. It is in this twofold moral experience that I find the surest and most satisfying ground for the belief in personal survival of death. One cannot live an empty, ephemeral, selfish worldly life and then expect, by some process of intellectual speculation, to arrive at this belief. You get it only when you find in yourself or in some other soul something infinitely worth preserving. It was their immediate perception of holiness in Jesus that made his disciples so sure of his escape from bondage unto death. And their intense consciousness of the possibility of such holiness in themselves persuaded them of their own immortality. That their Master, the incarnation of spiritual greatness, should be shut up in Sheol, among all the rest of the dead, was to them simply unthinkable. Equally unthinkable it was that they who had caught the contagion of that holiness should not share eternity with him. Moral experience was their foundation for faith in a future life.

Well enough for the sensualist, the sybarite, the *bon-vivant* to say, "I have had a good time for a goodly number

of years; I am satisfied and ready to pass out of life into nothingness." Well enough for the men and women who have lived for the lower satisfactions to feel indifferent to immortality. But for those who have dedicated and devoted themselves to the higher satisfactions of life, for those who have tasted intellectual, or æsthetic, or spiritual achievement and who know that the very best they have attained is a mere circumstance compared to what they feel they *could* attain, for them disbelief in immortality is the most difficult thing in the world. Like Plato and Dante and Goethe and Browning, they desire immortality above all else because of the moral experience they have undergone and the passion for further progress it has inspired. When a man tells me that he does not care for personal immortality, that he is satisfied to pass into oblivion at death, I am forced to conclude that he has somehow missed the moral experience that compels the conviction of continuity for his spiritual selfhood; I am persuaded that this man has never experienced deeper and intenser moral living from one year to the next.

The man of moral seriousness, who looks on life as a sacred privilege and trust, who has visions of heights to which his spiritual nature may climb, who has touched depths of refining spiritual experience, depths that are prophetic of others deeper still; the man who is capable of high and ennobling friendships, whose horizon embraces aims that are exalting and exalted,—that man will look on immortality as a priceless boon, not because of any opportunity that it offers for delights and rewards, but because of the opportunity that it offers for continuing the task of spiritual sculpture, for rounding out his character, for completing the dimensions of his being, for maturing the great life-purpose that here on earth had time only to blossom or perchance only to bud. For such a man, with such moral experience, conscious of ever deeper and intenser moral living, no alternative is open but belief in survival of his essential spiritual selfhood, to be somehow fitted, equipped for further progress toward "the goal set up" for him, albeit he can form no visual image of this equipment and knows moral progress here only in connection with brain and other bodily equipment.

It is, then, from the realm of ethics that we get our most helpful light on the momentous question of life after death.

What are we here for? We are here to realize the infinite possibilities of our being, or, to speak more accurately, we are here to enter on the realization of those possibilities.

This realization is the supreme good; the will that strives for the supreme good is the good will, and the good will cannot die in a universe that is rational and moral.

Nature has written in the constitution of each human being the law of its life,—develop the real that you are into the ideal you ought to be. Nature has imposed this moral obligation upon us, to strive for realization of that immanent ideal. But, clearly, that ideal can never be completely realized; it can be only eternally pursued. Perfection is no final, static, completed moral state, but an evolving process. The ideal flies ever before us. We pursue a fleeing goal. Our task is one in which everlasting progress may be made, not one that can be *finally* fulfilled.

Yes, the ideal is unattainable, and loyal pursuit of the unattainable ideal is our highest possible attainment. As the hyperbola forever approaches its asymptote but cannot reach it, so the real we are endlessly approximates the ideal we ought to be, but cannot overtake it.

Most of us only begin the upward ascent, we reach but a little way up the mount Perfection when our climb is stopped by death. Here, then, on the one hand, is Nature imposing upon us the moral obligation, "Be ye perfect," realize the ideal, and here, on the other hand, is death stopping us in our upward march and seemingly bringing that moral obligation to naught. How, I ask, shall we solve the riddle? Clearly we are forced to accept one or the other of two alternatives; either death is not the end of life and there is opportunity beyond death for continuing the ascent of the spiritual mountain, or else Nature defeats the end she had in view in the creating of man. That, I believe, is the logical alternative to which we are forced if we do close and consistent thinking. Nay more, we can go one step further and say that the loyal faithful soul, the soul that has been steadfastly loyal in the pursuit of the ideal, in the ascent of the mount Perfection, that soul is *entitled* to continue the pursuit when death has cut short the series of earthly endeavors. If this be a moral universe, if at the heart of the universe the principle of justice obtains, then, I say, the loyal, faithful soul, the man or woman who has consecratedly pursued the ideal, is thereby entitled, has a right, to continue that pursuit. If we loyally pursue the ideal, and that pursuit is the end which Nature has decreed in creating us, then she would defeat her end and be irrational did she allow death to cut off that pursuit. And if faithful pursuit constitutes a right to continue it, Nature would be unethical were she to disregard

that right. In the words of the lamented Dr. F. E. Abbot, "Personal immortality is an *ethical* necessity." And this is as near to demonstration as it is possible for us to come, in the present state of our knowledge.

The only rational view of our earthly pilgrimage is that of a progress of growth upward and onward endlessly, a *progressus ad Parnassum*. If, then, when the pilgrimage ends, our goal be still like a star shining in the distant heaven and we look up from the low plane of our present attainment to that star, what escape is there from the frightful unreason of such a situation? It is, so far as I can see, that death does *not* terminate the pilgrimage, but that somehow, somewhere, opportunity is afforded for the perpetuation of what is essentially spiritual in us, to the end that it may continue its consecrated devotion to the supreme purpose of its being.

To my reason immortality is the only possible solution of the mystery of life. Yet I realize the limited character and power of my reason and hence refrain from stating my faith as a dogma. It may be that in the universal plan not a single human being is accounted of sufficient value to the universe to require his preservation. It may be that the universal plan provides for some altogether different solution than that of personal immortality. But that the solution will be both rational and ethical I am bound to believe.

As yet, no human being knows whether matter is a "precipitate of mind" or mind a "sublimation of matter." This, in truth, is the measure of our ignorance, that when we are talking of origins we do not know exactly whence we came, and when we are discussing destiny we do not know precisely whither we go. What, then, remains between these two ignorances? There remains the kind of behavior we adopt between them. We have to choose whether we will live like Immortals, or like the dayfly, dead at sundown.

The story is told of a college president touring the Bernese Alps, going by the Gemmi Pass from Badzeuck on the one side to Kandersteg on the other. When he reached the summit of the pass he looked vainly about for a path that would lead to his destination. All that he saw was a narrow, faintly marked trail on the surface of the huge granite boulder, stretching down the steep mountain side. Such a trail it was as mountain sheep might risk, but hardly to be ventured upon by human feet. Concluding he had missed the right road, the pedestrian was

about to retrace his steps when he spied a little Swiss boy about forty feet away. "Where is Kandersteg?" the president exclaimed. To which the lad replied, "I don't know, sir, but (pointing to this hazardous trail) *that* is the way to it." Without in the least realizing it, the boy had summarized the whole practical philosophy of life. If you are on the right road, you don't need to see your destination. In such a situation—and it is symbolic of that in which we all find ourselves no matter what our vocation or lot in life may be—there are only three alternatives open to us: First, we may sit down, if our inertia be in excess of our motive power. Second, we may turn back, if our desire to reminisce be greater than our prophetic proclivity. Third, we may go bravely and trustfully on. In the sacred name of the latent possibilities that reside in each one of us, and of the constant residuum of capacity for progress that is present in even the lowest of us, I say, let us go on and take the ethics of an immortal being for our guide.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF INDUSTRY.

MORRIS KNOWLES, C.E.

1. *Obligation of Employer.*

The day of the farm hand being a member of the family and the apprentice boy deriving training and development from his individual employer is fast disappearing, even if it has not already passed. And with it has gone the personal touch and solicitation in the well-being of one's helpers that formerly existed in private employment. Large scale production and organization, made necessary by our expanding life and the keenness of competition, have created a real loss, the detriment of which we are now realizing as never before.

The Factory Acts of England and well-nigh universal legislation regarding safety, sanitation, and other working and living conditions represent this growing recognition of society that employers owe the State that its citizens shall work and live under circumstances that conduce to their physical, moral, mental, and civic health.

2. *Trusteeship of Wealth.*

We now understand that industry can no longer escape the responsibility that comes from inducing large numbers of people to congregate in a selected employment, a given community, attracted by the possibilities of labor and the fruits thereof. It is no longer considered a sufficient excuse to say that men need not take the jobs unless they want to, or that they may live where they please. It is recognized that in this respect man is not a free agent, because he is subservient to the conditions and surroundings that are created, or result from neglect to consider all of his needs.

In the early days of competition *laisser faire* was the policy of industrial development. The *protection* of *property* was the keynote of the social theory of that day. This, however, has passed and we are now in the midst of a political and social development which is reorganizing society on the basis of the policy of *social justice*, even if it involves restriction of *individual liberty*. *Human rights* is the keynote of the new era, as *property* rights was of the preceding one. The owner of wealth, the world's goods, and producer of resources holds not for himself, but for society, for the community of which he is a part; and rewards will be in proportion to service rendered.

3. *Welfare and Efficiency.*

a. Good surroundings both at home and at work contribute to efficiency of labor. The truth of this now does not seem to require demonstration. That the effect is sufficiently immediate is demonstrated by countless examples.

Many industrial leaders have been prompted to undertake "Welfare Work," including in addition to improved working facilities, provisions of good homes at moderate rents, town planning, entertainment, etc. The mere mention without elaboration recalls many instances to mind. The safety appliances, first aid, hospitals, toilet, washing and drinking facilities, baths, change houses, rest-rooms, pension, accident, old-age and disability funds, bonus, premiums, cash prizes, continuation schools, training classes, clubs, casinos, libraries, reading-rooms, movies, playgrounds, pageants, co-operative stores, and community activities of various kinds, all are to be found, or some at least, in connection with any modern industry and the town which is created for its workmen and their families. So common is the understanding of the desire, and so well-recognized the need, that many such activities have now become obligatory in the laws of some of the States.

b. There is a more far-reaching effect, however, which may not be demonstrable except over many generations, represented by the conservation and development of the race, the promotion of a better social organization, and the establishment of good feeling between peoples in different circumstances of life. The vision to think clearly and long into the future is not a common American trait, but is sorely needed in any such outlook on the Social Responsibility of Industry.

4. *Human Factor.*

The human factor is the most important criterion to remember in all such activities. Man does not take kindly to something forced upon him until he is ready for it — the process of education is necessary to appreciate some of the most important things of life. Those employers who have sincerely interested themselves in welfare work have in many cases made the discovery that not only the employees but themselves too, are human beings, all with the same frailties and desires, and that the return in warmer and more cordial human relation-

ship, in sharing the increased happiness of all, has been of far greater value than the increased efficiency that results.

The common understanding now of such work is well set forth in the phrase that "it must not be paternal"; it is but another way of giving expression to the human side of the problem, and it must be approached with the idea that "we are our brothers' keepers."

5. *The Religious Basis.*

It is all too common to find expressions of the view that scoffs at church and religious activity in the social service field. This is a religious assembly in the broadest sense, and it is fitting that voice should be given not only to the need which the churches must meet, but to the opinion that they are best-equipped with vision, patience, and a knowledge of the far-reaching effects of good and of bad service.

Successful welfare work cannot be based solely upon the motive of efficiency. In fact, numerous examples of failure can be traced to the thoughtless, selfish basis of the employer's pseudo-philanthropy that has immediate gains, only, in mind. Nor will philanthropy itself—the satisfaction in the increased well-being of one's fellowmen—alone fulfil the "Social Responsibility of Industry" unless it has in the last analysis a basis in religion.

Successful business and industrial men are much inclined to criticise church activities as inefficient, and to say that the Church has failed in dealing with the social problems of modern industrial life. Some of this perhaps may be justified, but no more than with machinery of any large organizations—civil or civic; but where the Church has failed it has been not on account of too much but because of too little social religion. Under the economic and social system of the future he who is most successful in meeting the social responsibility of industry and who will receive society's greatest rewards will be not only the most efficient and the most human, but also the most religious, in the sense that he will be firm in faith and in a realization of his brotherhood and service to mankind.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.